DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 313 CG 005 625

AUTHOR	Geis, Gilbert; And Others
TITLE	Ex-Addicts as Streetworkers. The Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project.
INSTITUTION	California State Coll., Los Angeles.; Economic Youth Opportunity Association.; Southern California Research Inst., Los Angeles.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 69
NOTE	153p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Gilbert Geis, Department of Sociology, California State College, 5151 State College Drive, Los Angeles, California 90032
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.80
DESCRIPTORS	Drug Abuse, *Drug Addiction, Drug Therapy, Narcotics, Socially Deviant Behavior

ABSTRACT

The Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project, located in a Mexican-American Community, attempted to answer the question: what happens when thirty ex-heroin addicts are hired at $600.00 per month to assist practicing addicts and potential drug users? The lengthy report discusses what the project was about, what it accomplished, and how it accomplished what it did. The major segments of the report deal specifically with the following aspects: (1) background; (2) ingredients of the proposal including scope and sponsorship; (3) a narrative history of the project; (4) job development activities; (5) the detoxification program; (6) the clients; and (7) the field workers. The strengths and weaknesses of the innovative program are clearly indicated. Because the project was not designed as a research experiment, and because of the subtle nature of success, evaluation was viewed as exceedingly complex. The report does, however, venture the conclusion that, based on the initial and continuing large numbers of persons who found their way to the Project, it was clearly offering a needed and appreciated service. (TL)

ED041313

EX-ADDICTS AS STREETWORKERS: THE BOYLE HEIGHTS NARCOTICS PREVENTION PROJECT

By Gilbert Geis, Bruce Bullington, and John G. Munns

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"The demonstration reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C. 20506, to the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency. The Opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of any agency of the United States Government."

CG005625

FOREWORD

The Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project represents a pioneering endeavor to employ former addicts in streetwork and other kinds of activities designed to assist persons currently involved with narcotics and dangerous drugs. In addition, as part of the Project, four former addicts worked for a school year in two junior high schools assisting health education teachers with their instruction regarding drugs.

The results of the educational program are reported in a separate document. The present report attempts to provide information and some of the flavor of the first year of operation of the streetwork program. Of necessity, much of the material is descriptive, but funds have been provided by the National Institute of Mental Health for a more intensive evaluation of the program during the coming year, when its results will have had time to become more manifest.

This report owes much to numerous individuals. In particular, Betty Ellingson, Narcotics Coordinator for the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency, and her successor, Donald Block, have been of inestimable help in assuring close and productive collaboration between the operating personnel and the research effort. George Potter, Director of the Southern California Research Institute, served as fiscal officer and offered research assistance during the year. Eduardo Aguirre and James Raner worked for a time with the co-authors of this report; their insight and intelligence were of great importance to our work. Finally, we need to express our appreciation to the staff of the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project, all of whom are listed by name on the following page. This is really their report.

BOYLE HEIGHTS NARCOTICS PREVENTION PROJECT STAFF ROSTER

1967 - 1968

Administration

Robert Lyons - Director
Juan Acevedo - Assistant Director
Robert Schasre - Field Coordinator
Art Sanchez - Family Counselor
Stanley Cohen - Group Counselor
Archie Aguirre - Assistant Field Coordinator
Cecil Miller - Assistant Field Coordinator

Field Staff

Manuel Acuna
Eduardo Aguirre
Gary Atkins
Charles Ayon
Louis Baca
Louis Brazon
Eliseo Campero
Sam Chavez
Henry Delgado
Rudy Dunn
Fernando Escarcega
Julie Estrada
Gary Gibson
Charles Harris
Terry Kariker
Terry Leon
Leonard Loman
Gilbert Madrid
David Martinez
Julio Martinez
Adolph Meza
Louis Montes
Terry Moore
Joe Ortiz
Floyd Pancil
James Pina
Ruben Pratti
Robert Ramirez
James Raner
Charlotte Reid
Sal Rodriguez
Benjamin Solis
Bobby Terrazzas
Toussaint Thomas
Margie Victorian
Betti Vuchsas
Strat Vuchsas
Steve Woolbert
Charles Yanez
George Yribe

Clerical Staff

Kay Kara
Terry Galvin
Grace Navarro
Maria Perez

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

I. BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT 4

II. INGREDIENTS OF THE PROPOSAL 7

III. NARRATIVE HISTORY OF THE PROJECT. 25

IV. JOB DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES. 74

V. THE DETOXIFICATION PROGRAM. 90

VI. THE PROJECT'S CLIENTS 107

VII. THE FIELD WORKERS 123

VIII. EIGHTEEN MONTH EXPERIENCE FOR FIELD WORKERS 136

SUMMARY 147

CG 005 625

Gilbert Geis
Department of Sociology
California State College
5151 State College Drive
Los Angeles, California 90032

Southern California
Research Institute

Economic and Youth
Opportunities Agency

EX-ADDICTS AS STREETWORKERS: THE BOYLE HEIGHTS NARCOTICS PREVENTION PROJECT

By Gilbert Geis, Bruce Bullington, and John G. Munns

This report attempts to respond to the following question: What happens when some thirty persons with lengthy imprisonment records for heroin use, are hired at salaries of $600 a month and charged with the task of assisting practicing addicts and persons who appear in danger of drug use?

The Project which attempted to provide answers to the question - The Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project, located in the Mexican-American community of East Los Angeles - was in many ways unique. It operated with funds supplied through the Federal poverty program, but it was essentially a private undertaking. The former addicts had, at the outset, few guidelines and little experience to draw upon, only the declared mission of "reducing addiction in the area," and "helping people." They chose three supervisors to set up and run the program, one a man with considerable experience in the State correctional service, the second a Mexican-American with political expertise in the community, and the third a trainer in the poverty program who had worked some years earlier as an interviewer at a State-run halfway house for narcotic addicts. For the most part, persons associated with the Project improvised as they went along, facing crises - such as the unanticipated need for a detoxification facility - as they arose.

Today, some fifteen months after the Boyle Heights Project began, a fairly coherent set of policies and attitudes can readily be discerned. Personnel turnover has been high, partly perhaps, because of the unstructured demands of the job, but probably more significantly because of the uncertainties that surround refunding that lay as a shadow over the program almost from the moment of its inception. There have been workers who have returned to drug use. There have also been instances of clients who, against all odds, didn't become involved with drug use, apparently because of the intervention of the ex-addict workers.

Such items are among those treated in this report, which attempts to provide some indication of what the Boyle Heights program was all about, what it accomplished, and how it accomplished what it did. The report is a distillation of many other things, some 1,200 pages of typewritten field notes compiled during the first year of the experimental program, dozens of thick dossiers on each employee of the Project, and check sheets regarding the characteristics and progress of clients with whom Project employees worked. We will attempt to transmit some understanding of the successes and failures of the program, its dynamics, the lessons that were learned, and the plans for the future.

To do this, we will divide our material roughly into introductory notes, followed by a chronology of events during the course of the Project, and then more detailed examinations of major segments of the program that developed, such as job placement and detoxification services. We will also concentrate attention on the backgrounds, performances, and eventual fates of the employed ex-addicts during the period of the Project, and on persons they served as clients and these persons' subsequent careers. In the appendix, we will include reproductions of three published papers which grew out of research activities associated with the Project, as well as copies of interview schedules.

I. BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

Public Law 89-794, amending the 1964 Federal Office of Economic Opportunity Act, was signed by the President on November 8, 1966. Section 211-2(b) of the Law read as follows:

> ...the Director shall formulate and carry out programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. Such programs shall include provisions for the detoxification, guidance, training, and job placement of narcotic addicts.

Records of Congressional debates on Public Law 89-794 provide no information regarding the rationale behind the section calling for federal efforts in the field of narcotics in poverty areas. The section was reportedly put into the poverty measure by Representative Adam Clayton Powell, then chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, presumably with an eye toward providing additional funds to deal with the narcotics problem in the Harlem (New York) constituency Powell represented as well as in other urban neighborhoods marked by economic malaise and heavy narcotics usage. Congress appropriated more than $12 million dollars for the purpose outlined in Section 211-2(b).

Los Angeles had traditionally received about one-twelfth of funds available for poverty programs. For officials in the Los Angeles Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency, therefore, the appropriation of monies for narcotics projects offered the opportunity to blueprint a $1 million dollar undertaking along the lines indicated in the very general language of Congress.

In late February, 1967, the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity published "Guidelines for Funding Under Section 211-2 of the Economic Opportunity Act," and called for applications to be in Washington within five weeks. The "Guidelines" indicated a rationale for narcotics programs as part of the anti-poverty effort - "if the addict is not poor at the start," it was observed, "his 'habit' will almost surely make him so eventually." The Guidelines also noted that Los Angeles, Chicago and New York, had more than half of the nation's addicts within their boundaries, and they stipulated that proposed programs should be organized to assure that "services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas, or furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation, and wherever possible are combined with, or included within arrangements for providing employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served." It was stipulated that the programs should be aimed at persons using "hard" drugs, such as opiates, rather than marijuana, amphetamines, or barbiturates.

The statement in the Guidelines which underlay the proposal prepared in Los Angeles was the following:

> Applicants are encouraged to consider new approaches to the prevention of narcotic drug addiction and to rehabilitation of the drug addict. This may include, though it is not limited to, better utilization of professional and non-professional staff, training of indigenous and/or formerly addicted workers in new health roles, new approaches to counseling, guidance, control, or motivation, and new avenues of approach to prevention.

The decision to concentrate the program in East Los Angeles was prompted in part by the fact that the addiction problems in that area were intense and were familiar to the persons writing the Proposal for Federal funds. Given the limited time available, it was deemed expedient to concentrate upon an area of need, where it appeared likely that community support could be enlisted. There was an implicit assumption that if the Project proved successful, it then could be expanded to other parts of the city. From an evaluative viewpoint, it was deemed desirable to concentrate program efforts within a manageable context for, as the Guidelines stipulated, it was necessary that "proposals should include provision for the orderly evaluation of the program and its results."

II INGREDIENTS OF THE PROPOSAL

To appreciate properly the manner in which the Boyle Heights Project developed, as outlined in this report, it is essential to compare developments with the original blueprint of the program. The relevant segments of the application submitted by the Los Angeles Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency follow:

Introduction

Approaches to the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts have persistently shown rather poor results. It is believed that failure to include comprehensive community-centered elements in institutional programs undercuts much of their chance for success. The Federal narcotics hospitals at Fort Worth and Lexington, for example, both operating without follow-up services for their patients, have produced failure rates of more than 60 per cent among the detoxified addicts during the first year after their release.

More recent programs focusing upon intensive care within the community have shown somewhat better outcomes. The New York State parole authorities believe that authoritarian approaches represent the best method for handling addicts, who are alleged to have a need for clearcut, relatively inflexible guidelines. Detection of re-addiction in New York, until inauguration earlier this year of the commitment program, has primarily been dependent upon the ability of the agent to discern personal or physical indices and, under such circumstances, reported success rates must be viewed with some suspicion.

In California, particular attention has been paid to reduced caseloads, with parole agents handling released addicts under a correctional regimen with quasi-medical overtones. Thirty-man caseloads were employed both in the Narcotic Treatment Control Program and during the past several years in the out-patient segment of the State's civil commitment program. California has pioneered as well in establishing residential halfway houses for released narcotic addicts, employing such facilities as way-stations both for men newly released and for those appearing to be in danger of relapse.

Approaches such as those undertaken by official governmental agencies in New York and in California have succeeded in destroying the myth that narcotic addicts are incapable of abandoning their reliance upon opiates or other dangerous drugs, even though they have had large habits persisting over long periods of time. These programs have not as yet, however, put to rest the view that narcotic addiction is an extra-ordinarily intransigent form of human indulgence, highly resistent to present attempts at control.

The major shortcoming of present rehabilitative approaches appears to be their inability to establish adequate and thoroughgoing rapport with addicts and to penetrate into the pervasive subculture that constitutes the addict world. Failing to do so, the programs are unable to gain the leverage apparently necessary to inculcate "square" values and bring about conforming behavior. State officials, primarily charged with social protection, cannot but be viewed with suspicion by addict clients, who know that their very freedom will be at stake if they discuss or disclose information about past or present illegal activities. In addition, State correctional and mental health personnel tend to come from backgrounds quite dissimilar from those of the average drug addict. Language is different, communication is awkward, and the results of such disparity tend to produce outcomes ranging from disappointing to distressing.

Programs such as those operated at Synanon and Daytop Village, both residential facilities managed for addicts by former addicts, appear to indicate that narcotic addicts, like alcoholics, may be particularly responsive to individuals who, like themselves, have experienced similar desires and suffered similar setbacks but who, unlike themselves, have now managed to become abstinent.

Synanon is believed to have effected the rehabilitation of a greater proportion of narcotic addicts than any other large-scale program yet undertaken in the United States. Numerical documentation for this accomplishment however, is not available, because Synanon operates on the assumption that success breeds further success and that any suggestion that entrants might fail undercuts the morale of such persons, nudging them towards re-use of drugs. Daytop Village, operated on Synanon principles under the auspices of the Probation Department of the King's County Court in New York, with NIMH funds, is still in the process of analyzing data on its experiences.

Residential facilities such as Synanon, despite their claims of success, have been severely criticized. Primary concentration of such criticism has been upon the alleged infantilization of the addict, the so-called substitution of dependence on Synanon in place of dependence upon drugs. It is said that Synanon is an "artificial" situation, withdrawn from the prosaic reality of everyday life. It is also maintained that the rehabilitative tactics of Synanon are degrading and brutalizing and thereby drive away sizeable numbers of persons unable to accept the vitriolic abuse considered part of the initiation and treatment process. It is further maintained that Synanon caters only to a highly selective group of addicts, one marked by the relative absence of lower-class persons and particularly, in the Los Angeles area, of Mexican-Americans. In essence, judgement on Synanon, stripped of its polemics, seems to be that it is a kind of facility and kind of approach pre-eminently suitable for particular kinds of drug addicts.

The present program represents an attempt to abstract from Synanon the principle that seems to contain greatest merit -- that of employing former addicts in intensive work with persons presently tied to the addict subculture and those without ties who historically are known to be in imminent danger of readdiction.

The program also represents an attempt to avoid those ingredients of Synanon which, until the time when they are (if they are) shown to be absolutely essential for success, appear to be less desirable. In particular, by concentrating its energies on street work, the present program more nearly duplicates for its clientele those conditions with which they are more usually confronted. It permits continuing of work, of family life, and of neighborhood existence. Perhaps, of course, addicts cannot, under present therapeutic regimens, actually continue drug-free in their usual surroundings. If so, this is information that needs to be determined with some accuracy before addicts are preempted from such existence. The proposal also offers the opportunity to weigh advantages of Synanon against alternative approaches.

The present program also represents an attempt to determine if former addicts, engaged in helping services, can themselves, benefit from the provision of such services in a street setting. And finally, the present program represents an attempt to offer services never before organized on such a scale or under such conditions to persons who have in the past been particularly impervious to standard attempts to keep from drug use.

Sponsorship and Auspices

The model for the work of former narcotics addicts with parolees and other community members involved in problems related to drug usage is in part drawn from that built up in recent years in street work with juvenile gangs. First begun in New York by workers with the Youth Board, gang work has expanded until it now is surrounded by a vast literature, several operating manuals, diverse anecdotal accounts of such work, and the most attractive testament of all -- a not inconsiderable belief that the activities of detached workers have contributed in large measure to the striking decrease in aggressive and violent gang activity in cities such as Los Angeles, New York, and Chicago during the past several years.

Personnel for the street work will be recruited by the present program in large measure, from among the ranks of members of the Narcotics Symposium, a self-help group begun in California in 1963, and now numbering nearly 100 members throughout the State.

The Symposium has functioned with the enthusiastic support of the California Department of Corrections, which has provided space, both in its institutions and in its parole offices, for Symposium activities, and has agreed to put in abeyance for Symposium members its usual rule that parolees may not associate with one another.

The background of the Narcotics Symposium is recounted in a news story in the Sacramento, California, Bee, January 22, 1967:

> A new approach to combatting drug addiction is being tried at the California Conservation Center by a group of inmates, all former narcotics addicts.
>
> They call their group Narcotics Symposium and have set up only two requirements for membership -- an honest desire to quit using drugs and to refrain from acts of violence.
>
> "We have a different problem from the rest of the prison population," says one of the group's leaders. "We've got to be with other addicts, people we can identify with and discuss our problems with. We understand each other."

The news story proceeds to indicate that the correctional authorities have set aside a special dormitory in Susanville for Symposium members and that the journey to that site by inmates represents both a physical and an ideological transfer of allegiance from the prison code to a different set of rules of conduct. The story continues:

> "We're an action group," says one member. "We group all the time. If a man has a problem in the middle of the night, we'll group right then. We'll do everything we can to try to help him with his problem."
>
> Members of the group feel there is a need for chapters of Narcotics Symposium on the outside. One

> convict puts it this way. "Most of the time you can't go to a minister or your parole agent, neither one of them has the time. They don't really understand. The minister will tell you to pray. The parole agent has such a big caseload he can't spend very much time with you. You've got to get with someone who understands. He's the one who can help. I believe one addict can help another addict if both have the same goals in mind."

It is not difficult to discern in the activities and in the written constitution of the Symposium group, various principles drawn from Synanon. There is, for example, a tacit rejection of the Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous program format of a speaker and testimonies. Rather the Symposium members favor more direct discussion of common problems and they duplicate some of the challenge tactics indigenous to the Synanon approach.

The Symposium group, already operating on a voluntary part-time basis in the community, its members employed elsewhere and using their free time to attempt to assist newly released addicts into the community and to contact other parolees or other individuals involved in the drug world, can serve readily as the core treatment group for the proposed program in Boyle Heights. It has some coherence, a reasonably articulated philosophy, and it has the wholehearted support of correctional authorities. Working under a program coordinator, with consultation available from psychiatric residents, the former addicts, adequately paid, should be able to provide a decent test of the hypotheses that they can improve on the rehabilitative record of those programs currently in operation in an area beset with the city's most serious narcotics problem.

The Symposium has provisions in its by-laws for a Board of Directors carefully drawn from the community which the organization serves.

Scope of Services

The former addicts will be provided with a list of individuals paroled into the target area from California's institutions, including those released from the civil commitment facility at Norco. Each parolee will be contacted by a former addict within 24 hours of his arrival in the area he has designated for his parole residence. Efforts will be made to enroll this individual in an ongoing program of group meetings. Job opportunities will be sought so that the individual, in the event that his stipulated parole job fails to materialize, will not be bereft of work and income during the crucial readjustment period. Additional community resources which appear to be of value to particular men will be called to their attention -- knowledge of such resources will be one of the items conveyed during the training program for former addicts to be employed in the program.

It may be anticipated that a number of the men approached -- how many we are not certain -- will reject the proferred services of the former addicts. Subsequent contact will nonetheless be made with such individuals on the presumption that early bravado in some instances may take more realistic turns as the demands of community living bear down on the parolee.

In addition to their direct contact with parolees, the former addicts will engage in street work ventures similar to those undertaken by detached workers. They will attempt to form liaisons with juvenile groups in which drugs are employed. They will follow up on referrals made to them by persons employed in the school program who meet with pupils voluntarily undertaking such association. Meetings for family members will be arranged and a wide span of community activities will be established. During these activities, the former addicts will undoubtedly become involved with persons other than parolees who are engaged to take advantage of the expertise and the facilities afforded by the former addicts.

Finally, the headquarters of the service program will remain open 24 hours a day, with coffee and bread and peanut butter (a symbolic Synanon staple) on hand for visitors. Telephone communications to the headquarters will be encouraged both by personal contact and through advertisement in the mass media regarding availability of assistance.

Detoxification will be available at the nearby Los Angeles County Hospital when needed. Legal services, in line with the current proposal, would be available through an added staff member and law students at the Legal Aid Clinic adjacent to the target area.

Detoxification presents several problems unique to California because of its program of civil commitment for narcotic addicts. Physicians are required by law (Health and Safety Code, sec. 11395) to report to the State all patients being treated for addiction. Under the civil commitment statute any person, including the police, may file a petition to have an addict or a person believed to be in immenent danger of addiction, committed to the California Rehabilitation Center. There is almost total consensus (manifested by the low rate of voluntary commitments) among users of narcotics that CRC commitment is an outcome to be avoided, since it entails seven to nine months of institutionalization in a facility operated by the Department of Corrections and a seven-year period of "out-patient" status, under supervision by parole agents.

Detoxification therefore, is almost uniformly carried on in the so-called "hype tank" after the addict has been arrested, or, on occasion, by medical doctors who avoid reporting requirements by treating the addict for ills loosely labeled as "nervous exhaustion." Any formal program of detoxification attached to the proposed program would be tantamount to a one-way ticket out of the program into the civil commitment facility, an outcome which, desirable or not, would be strongly resisted by program participants. It needs to be noted, finally, that former addicts in Los Angeles report ability to reduce their own usage through employment of paregoric and barbiturates in place of heroin. In addition, facilities such as Synanon exempt from State reporting procedure, can be used as a referral for detoxification. Synanon is known to have supportive atmosphere very conducive to withdrawal.

Continuity of service will be provided primarily by the project director, serving as coordinator between the various elements of the present proposal as well as in a liaison relationship with the poverty program and similar endeavors in Los Angeles. Continuity is based in particular on the established flow of parolees from the institutions (where a number of them have already established Symposium contact) into the community as well as on the possibility of referrals from the school population to the community-focused program and from indications of malaise in school-age children (either uncovered in street work or through family work) back into the school for assistance.

The major ingredient of the program will be intensive group counseling sessions to which program participants will be exposed during three evenings a week. As an adjunct to this group participation, individual counseling will also be conducted on an individual need basis.

Of at least equal significance to the group and individual counseling component of this program, is the strategy of assigning the responsibility for the well-being of other addicts to those addicts who became active in the program. Providing an opportunity to learn the frustrations ordinarily involved in work with drug users, puts the treaters in the position of correctional workers faced with the same task.

Underlying all aspects of the treatment effort will be one essential theme -- narcotics users have problems because they use narcotics. Acceptance of this idea makes it essential that, if addicts want reduction in the number and severity of their problems, discontinuance of drug usage is the first step that must be taken.

There is an important corollary of the basic premise. It suggests that discontinuance of narcotics is merely the first step in the process necessary to learning to be successfully socialized. Subsequent steps include the logic of respect for people in the most general sense, including "squares," authority figures family members, and selves.

The program goals of the Symposium have been spelled out in the following terms:

1. To coordinate narcotic offender rehabilitative efforts with those of the California Department of Corrections.
2. To solicit active engagement of paroled narcotic

offenders in therapeutic group sessions conducted by the Symposium.

3. To encourage and assist, in those cases where it seems advisable, recourse to other self-help organizations such as Narcotics Anonymous, Alcoholics Anonymous, Teen Challenge and Synanon.
4. To actively seek out all newly released narcotic offenders, as well as those currently in the community, to acquaint them with the program, and to obtain their active participation in the group therapy sessions and other program activities.
5. To conduct regularly scheduled group therapy sessions.
6. To actively promote, both within the therapy sessions and in less structured situations, the destruction of the convict code.
7. To develop leadership capabilities within the ranks of the Symposium for the purpose of expanding program activities.
8. To utilize existing resources, as well as develop new approaches to the special problems of employment and job development for addicts.
9. To provide counseling services aimed at ameliorating or resolving addict-family problems.
10. To actively promote the use of community detoxification facilities in cases where contacts are made with physically addicted drug users.

11. To evaluate the effect of program involvement by comparing parolees who do not commit themselves to the program with those who do.

The Board of Directors will be required to examine the operation of the program at stated short intervals. It is hoped that members of the Board will be able to devote some time to actual involvement in the program so that ideas for its refinement can be formulated on the basis of such experience.

The common problem of addiction should provide a firm foundation for rapport and respect among both vamily members of clients, the clients themselves, and the program staff.

The program will not intrude into the lives of those persons who do not express an interest in its assistance. Individuals who do participate voluntarily in program activities will be, in terms of the program rationale, regarded as persons deserving of respect and assistance.

Services will be available throughout the day and night.

Professional staff will be selected in terms of their qualifications and competence to do the outlined job. Recruitment of staff will be the task of the delegate agencies with veto power vested in the applicant.

Staffing patterns have been arrived at after due regard to the number of parolees to be served, the nature of the school program and its demands, and the general requirements of the community, with regard to the likelihood of reasonable return on expenditure.

Staff has not yet been selected, but guidelines will be in accord with Federal policy.

Health science students will be involved with the former addicts in the training program, if arrangements now underway can be completed with the colleges in the vicinity of the target area.

Training will include compulsory involvement of the former addicts in the two-week daily seminar on narcotics addiction, a program of national stature, at California State College, Los Angeles. Tentative arrangements have been made to permit the addicts to audit this college course. The mental health board will provide further programs of initial and later in-service training for all professional staff, and funds have been requested for consultants to participate in diverse workshops and in-service programs for the personnel.

Eligibility criteria will assure that OEO services are being focused on persons in an area with a high concentration of poverty.

Site and Facility

The program using former addicts as street work treaters and as supervisors of day and evening meetings and programs will be housed in a single building, open 24 hours each day. Space has not yet been located, though the Boyle Heights area is currently under intensive block-by-block survey for a suitable site. The building would be as accessible as possible. The notorious transportation dilemmas of Los Angeles will inevitably constitute a source of some difficulty, though the area is above average in terms of its availability.

Efforts are also currently underway to determine if other funds might be available for the rental of the necessary space, but time to date has not permitted any very definitive exploration of the problem, and the time demands for mounting the program might further deter a more thorough canvas.

It is anticipated that the rental site will not require any but the simplest renovation since no persons will be residing in the facility.

Further Introductory Notes -- Since a general portrait of Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles appears in the report, "Ex-Addicts in the Schools," concentrates upon the use of former addicts working with the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project in two junior high schools, an undertaking which formed part of the proposal, though it lent itself most readily to separate evaluation and reporting. Some early history of conflict between the Los Angeles poverty program and members of the County Commission on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs is also recounted in the school report, and will not be duplicated here.

Finally, it should be noted that proposed relationships with Synanon were never established, partly as a result of Synanon's intransigence on matters that were considered basic by poverty program officials, to a cooperative effort, and partly because of political hostility to the granting of funds to Synanon. In addition, because of intense objection of State officials, the legal aid segment of the proposed program was eliminated prior to the granting of funds.

III. NARRATIVE HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

There were a number of general principles upon which the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project was built, as the application for Federal support indicates, and these principles played a prominent part in determining the manner in which the Project evolved. The three major themes underlying the Project were: 1) that addiction is not an incurable and immutable condition; but rather a condition which is responsive to adequate efforts to deal with it; 2) that such efforts can best be carried out in the community rather than in either a correctional institution or a hospital setting; and 3) that such efforts can best be carried on by individuals familiar with narcotics use through personal addiction, individuals who have now ceased such use, and who show an interest in remaining drug abstinent.

Little credence was given to the viewpoint that addiction to opiates is an "illness," or that it is any other kind of pathology analagous to a medical disorder. It was believed that the alleged proof of such a thesis was essentially tautological, growing out of statements such as the following: "Addicts are sick persons because addiction is an illness."

There was also considerable doubt regarding the accuracy of the common observation that drug addiction represents a "symptom" of an underlying personality disturbance and that it was necessary to cauterize the basic malaise before the addiction would be eliminated. Rather there was a conviction underlying the blueprint of the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project that opiate addiction represents a response to learning experiences and to social conditions, that it is essentially a pleasant, even an ecstatic habit, that will be given up only in the face of more compelling lures and more attractive ways of life.

The environment from which virtually all of the men and women who became clients of the Project came was regarded as in large measure closely related to their history of addiction. Drugs were endemic in Boyle Heights, and there were few inhibiting strictures concerning their inappropriateness. In the middle class, for instance, heroin use is regarded as unhealthy, leading to physical distress, long-term abdictation of control over one's activities, and to similar consequences incompatible with values of the socioeconomic strata. Abstinence from drugs, once the desire for cessation is born in the individual, is difficult in Boyle Heights because of the absence of alternative paths which guarantee some ease and pleasure.

The pattern indicated is perhaps most clearly portrayed by the records of medical doctors who become addicted to drugs. Subject to intense professional demands at times, living with erratic time schedules and many diverse pressures, and having drugs at hand which can alleviate some of their distress, doctors, not surprisingly, show a highly disproportionate number of addicts in their ranks compared to other professional groups. In Los Angeles County, where a computer process screens drug prescriptions, it is presumed that all or virtually all of the doctors who become addicted to drugs are apprehended. The most common punishment inflicted on them by the State Board of Medical Examiners is withdrawal of their prescription-writing privileges for a period of five years. Despite the benign nature of the treatment - or perhaps in part because of it - it is reported that some 92 percent of the doctors are cured, and that they do not return to drugs.

The relevance of the medical analogy to the Boyle Heights Project seems clear. It indicates that narcotic addicts can be cured without the necessity of harsh punishments and within the community which fostered their addiction - provided that they have some incentive, both a reward and a threat, for abstinent behavior.

At the same time, reported results from Synanon, though less well rooted in numerical soil than the experiences of the County's medical addicts, indicate with some force that converted narcotic addicts possess a striking ability to deal with their errant fellows in a manner likely to convince such persons to cease their use of drugs. The previous experience of the ex-addict apparently adds an important dimension of relevance to his rehabilitative efforts with practicing addicts. In addition, converts, that is, former addicts now inveighing against addiction, seem to have more intense emotional convictions than individuals with less direct experience. At the same time, it is understood that permitting one person to assist a second is apt to be of considerable aid to the first person, who is forced to articulate reasons for conformity and who is faced with cautionary material regarding what he had once been and could again become.

Three major components, then served as guiding ideas for the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project. The first involved a community-centered approach to amelioration of drug problems; the second, self-help of addicts, initiated not by professionals but by former addicts; and third, voluntary participation in the program by clients. In combination, the three items were seen as creating a unique approach to help narcotic addicts, one which, on the basis of past experience and theory, offered a reasonable prospect of success, and one which could be duplicated fairly readily in other settings were it to prove worthwhile.

Initial staffing decisions -- The existence of the Narcotics Symposium group, made up of former addicts released from California prisons, provided a core around which the Boyle Heights Project could be built. This group was supplemented in the planning stage by administrator from the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency who had been responsible for putting together the proposal for the Project, as well as several consultants.

Partly in response to initial public criticisms of the program blueprint - matters which have been dealt with in detail in the report on the educational component of the Project - it was decided that the ex-addict employees would have to be responsible to non-addict administrators. These persons could offer the professional credentials and legitimacy without which the Project could be vulnerable to charges of "irresponsibility." Presumably, they could also add an element of experience that would otherwise be lacking. On the other hand, it should be stressed that the decision to employ "square" administrators clearly served to transmute a program operated by ex-addicts into one run by non-addicts in which ex-addicts were employed. It is impossible to indicate, of course, how the Project might have succeeded had no non-addicts been involved with it; it seems fair to say, though, that the employment of non-addicts served the purpose, seemingly of great importance, of permitting forceful intervention between the Project and the authorities. Thus, for instance, the Project Director quite often negotiated with state correctional officers to allow clients who were sought on warrants for absconding additional time to "clean up" or to grant them other considerations which they otherwise would not have been accorded.

The Project Director - Robert Lyons - was the first administrator hired, following interviews conducted by a small group of ex-addicts and EYOA staff members, with three candidates seeking the $15,000 a year job. Lyons had had 17 years of experience with the California Department of Corrections, rising through its ranks to the position of Parole Administrator. He was in the job market because he had been denied further promotion at the time, and because the Boyle Heights position appeared to offer a notable professional challenge. That he was chosen by the ex-addicts was testimony to his reputation among parolees, who tend to be familiar with all of the state's experienced correctional personnel.

On the job, Lyons, by the estimates of the workers and the research staff, clearly provided a kind of leadership that allowed the Project to proceed toward the coalescing of adequate operating principles and to survive many intramural crises without much agony. He was notably supportive of the workers, had considerable ability in separating truth from near-truth and from pure fiction, and yet managed to keep distance between himself and others that bred respect. As noted, it was Lyons' particular ability to intercede between clients and the correctional authorities, most of whom he knew personally, that give the Project much of its attraction to addicts in need of help. He could predict, with considerable accuracy, which appeals would have an impact upon which parole agents, and could fortell the amount of leeway a given agent would be apt to accord a client in difficulty.

It would be interesting to know the impact the Project had upon Lyons as well as his impact upon it. The best-available judgment is that constant association with ex-addicts and clients in difficulty, bearing upon a man who tended to place high value on loyalty to subordinates, created considerable sympathy for the position of the addict in the community. Lyons resigned his Project position after fourteen months, in large measure because of refunding uncertainties, though also because of an offer of an administrative position he wanted in the Department of Corrections.

Juan Acevedo was chosen assistant Project Director a month after Lyons had been hired. Acevedo, of Mexican-American descent, had served from 1959 to 1967 on the Youth Authority Board, members of which are appointed by the Governor, but had been replaced with the beginning of the term of Ronald Reagan. He had extensive political and social contacts in the East Los Angeles community, and was of considerable assistance in helping the workers obtain personal loans and loans for cars. He also handled many of the court cases involving clients, and was able to use his connections in the community to obtain hearings from local judges regarding clients' claims.

The third administrator - Robert Schasre - had been involved with the Project since its inception. He had been employed in the training section of the local poverty agency when it began formulating plans for a narcotics prevention program, and, because of his prior experience, had been asked to assist in drawing up the blueprint. Schasre had served for three years, from 1962 to 1965, as a research associate on the NIMH funded East Los Angeles Halfway House project, and in this capacity had conducted extensive intake interviews with former addicts paroled to the residential facility. The final report on the halfway house had noted that "Schasre ... established close friendships with many of the residents, friendships that represent some of the most encouraging and attractive aspects of the halfway house enterprise." His work had resulted in publication of a scholarly paper, "Cessation Patterns of Neophyte Heroin Users," which has often been cited in recent literature on addiction.

Schasre was offered his choice of a research post or an administrative position, and chose the latter. His appointment was approved by the ex-addicts from the Narcotics Symposium, and he served as the most immediate superior of the field workers. In this position, analagous to that of a factory foreman, he was forced to exert most of the direct pressure on the workers, and his relationships with them inevitably suffered as a consequence. Initially, comments by field workers invariably noted of Schasre that he was "personally concerned" and that "he cared." He was regarded as non-bureaucratic by the workers at first, but soon, as he sought to impose structure on the Project operations, these evaluations gave way to other appraisals. At one point, for instance, halfway through the first year of the Project, Schasre shrugged off worker objections to a new edict by noting that "I'm just living up to my bureaucratic image." By then, he was being regarded as the "bad cop" playing against Lyons' "good cop" role, a performance that a number of the field workers, perpetual cynics, believed was deliberately contrived. As with Lyons, Schasre undoubtedly changed somewhat as he was forced to translate his beliefs and theories into practice. To the research workers, the most notable aspect of such change was in the direction of imposing control upon the workers. For one thing, Schasre, early in the Project found himself faced with jobs, particularly paper-work jobs, that he felt the workers should be, but were not, doing. For another, the obligation to account to higher administrators placed a burden upon him which he believed should be at least equivalently borne by the workers.

The first two supervisors among the ex-addicts were chosen from members of the Narcotics Symposium Board of Directors. One had been the primary moving force behind formation of the Symposium. Rather flamboyant, energetic, erratic, and articulate, he clearly had the prime position of leadership among the field workers at the Project's outset, though his prestige and power would diminish almost day by day, until he resigned under pressure, seven months later. The other supervisor was older and separated himself from the average worker by a somewhat self-conscious lectuality. He served as a buffer between the other ex-addict supervisor and his increasing troubles with workers and administrators, but never assumed a powerful position of leadership.

Interviews with prospective employees began in June. Brief application forms indicating the person's age, sex, past work history, and recent correctional experience, formed the basis for informal interviews between applicants and working staff members. Most of the persons hired were friends or acquaintances of the supervisors, who reported that they had some difficulty at this time locating persons who met the minimum employment qualification - that they had been drug free on the streets during the past six months. Later, however, the Project was flooded with applications, so that at one point there were more than 200 persons competing for five Project vacancies.

By July, 18 field workers had been hired, with the idea that the staff would gradually be increased to 28 persons. The workers received a salary of $600 per month at first, though at the end of the first few months of Project work, this figure was changed to a starting salary of $400 with periodic raises to $600 being based upon the newcomer's performance in the field. Thus, in this respect as in so many others relating to the method in which it evolved, traditional incentive and reward patterns of the regular marketplace found their way into the Narcotics Prevention Project.

The First Months: Training and Planning: -- The pattern for the Project called for an initial orientation period devoted to training sessions and planning operations. It had been expected that the training period would include registration at evening classes at California State College, Los Angeles, which dealt with narcotic problems, but funding delays carried the inauguration of the Project beyond the period during which the course was offered.

Difficulties in having money released from Washington, in fact, caused a good deal of distress during the early period of the Project and hovered bleakly, cutting into morale, until the Project had been underway for six weeks. For one thing, the absence of paychecks created a certain disbelief among the workers that the Project, surprising enough to them in its conception, had actually been approved. To support the staff, the project director and the field coordinator both withdrew $2,500 of their own savings from the bank, and distributed it among the workers. Ultimately, all but $300 of the money was repaid.

The failure of funds to arrive as promised also delayed acquisition of a site in which the training sessions and future operations could be conducted. For the time, the workers met in the East Los Angeles Halfway House, a state parole office, where additional space had become available when the residential program had been ended.

Training sessions were held each day during the first three weeks of September. The weather was sultry, and the sessions generally something less than inspiring. Many of the workers were constantly late in arriving and inattentive. Administrator threats that fines would be levied for tardiness carried little weight, given the fact that the workers saw no immediate prospect of receiving salary checks. Some group pressure began to be mounted against late-comers shortly after the initial training sessions, a tactic that was to become increasingly familiar as a sizeable coterie of workers defined to others what they regarded as "proper" behavior on the part of aspirants to professional images. That the cautions were not always heeded was clearly illustrated by the act of one of the ex-addict supervisors who climbed on a table during a training session and took picutres of the group for several minutes, completely distracting the speaker and his audience.

The training sessions dealt in essence with two matters. One concerned work methods, and was geared to turn a group of former addicts, with little experience in areas such as social work, into effective street workers, responsive to the requirements of their clients. The second was designed to indicate the structure of the Project, its relationship to the poverty program, to the state correctional authorities, and its internal organizational framework.

Among the problems arising in the second area, was the need to define with some clarity, the relationship between the Project and the Narcotics Symposium, the group from which the Project had drawn its leadership and part of its rationale. For the ex-addict supervisor, the Project was seen as an auxiliary arm of the Symposium, serving to increase its membership and extend its power. For the Project administrators, the Project and the Symposium were regarded as quite separate entities. The self-help Symposium would have its own meetings, recruit its own members; while the Project would be free to accept clients only from within the geographical boundaries specified by the Federal poverty agency. It could hire workers as it chose, without the need for approval from the Symposium Board of Directors. For a time, the unstructured nature of the Project-Symposium relationship saw the Symposium holding power within the Project. Workers were required, for instance, to attend Symposium meetings during weekday evenings and were paid for such attendance. Gradually, however, partly because of the growing coolness between the Project administrators and the Symposium, the Symposium began to become of less and less importance to the Project. In addition to growing internal disorganization in the Symposium group, its ethnic membership, more heavily weighted towards blacks, operated against commitment by Project workers, who were predominantly Mexican-Americans.

The training meetings were further beset with continuous petty bickerings, which probably could have been anticipated, given the early jockeying for position and prestige and the novelty of the undertaking. Discussions tended to be discursive and protocol was uncertain. The field workers, having been indoctrinated in the tactics of group therapy in prisons, often brought to bear verbal talents that they had refined in such prison group sessions, but which were not altogether appropriate for more didactic kinds of learning situations.

Most importantly, the administrators exhibited great reluctance to establish concrete guidelines. At one meeting, for example, the issue of Project attitudes toward marijuana was raised. The workers enunciated mixed opinions about the harmful consequences of marijuana usage. At the same time, they agreed that public attitudes regarding the drug were strongly negative. What should a worker speaking before a junior high school group say, they wanted to know, when he thought that the only thing wrong with using marijuana was that it was illegal? There was a lengthy discussion, but no precise policy emerged from it, and the workers were left to fend for themselves. Ultimately, as the report on the school program indicates, they first had to get into difficulty because of their "liberal" views on marijuana before they became discrete and evasive concerning this issue.

In part, the administrators deliberately avoided pronouncements on controversial matters or on matters regarding proper field work procedure. "You are the experts," the field workers were told, "It's up to you to tell us how this problem should be handled." It was difficult to determine whether such attitudes were encouraging to the workers or disconcerting. Pervasive correctional beliefs indicate that persons who use opiates tend to be most responsive to very well structured situations. On the other hand, there is equally compelling evidence that trust is most effectively elicited, all other things being equal, by a display of trust.

The workers' reactions to the training sessions were sought through interviews conducted in mid-October by research workers. Most expressed reactions were critical. "The ones I attended were somewhat boring," one worker indicated, expressing a common sentiment. "I didn't get too much out of it. I learned the rules of EYOA, but not much else. Lousy." Other remarks included the following: "There was no order or organization"; "They didn't teach us anything we didn't already know. There was not discipline at all"; "People were always walking in and out;" "It could have been condensed to one-half of the time";

"We got daily information which contradicted the information we got the day before"; "The money situation greatly affected morale - we all got the feeling that the administration wasn't leveling with us."

In addition to the specific negative remarks, the workers indicated a particular concern regarding the absence of guidelines for dealing with diverse street situations. They wanted, in a sense, to be led in training by the hand through a series of experiences which would prepare them for their first day on the job. How should they approach a potential client? What should they say if he lied to them? How could they recognize psychological disturbances of various kinds? These and a plethora of similar kinds of issues puzzled and bothered them in the days before they began their field experiences.

Some of the evaluations of the training sessions were, however, less critical than those given above. One worker noted, for instance: "They were pretty loose, but I didn't mind. I came to this Project open-minded and didn't expect much. We got some feelings out in the open and that's good." Among the enthusiastic evaluations, of which there were, it needs to be noted, very few, was the following: "I got a lot out of it. I never had a group session like this, except at the joint, where it was on a compulsory basis. I learned a lot. I felt very comfortable. Good training."

The field workers were also asked what they would have done differently had they been in charge of the training period. Suggestions included shortening the sessions, appointing a sergeant-at-arms to maintain order and minimize interruptions, bringing in professional persons to talk about group counseling, Mexican culture, and similar job-related items; putting up a bulletin board with notices indicating the day's tasks and other Project news; and formulating concrete Project policies.

Late in August, a building complex was located at 507-511 Echandia Street in East Los Angeles which would serve as Project headquarters. Three adjacent store fronts were leased and plans for renovation begun. It would not be until mid-September that the first Project workers would be able to occupy the building, and the remodeling would continue for several months beyond this date, delaying full-scale operations until mid-October.

Relationships with The Police -- It was early in the life history of the Project that the first encounter with the police took place. Several neighborhood youngsters were talking with a former addict on Brooklyn Avenue, East Los Angeles' main thoroughfare, when a squad car stopped and several officers approached the group. The former addict had been in the habit of hanging around Project workers, apparently with the idea of securing employment. As the officers came near, he told the youngsters to go inside a nearby building. Then he placed himself in front of the policemen and told them that they could not enter the building without a search warrant. The former addict identified himself as an employee of the Boyle Heights Project and took the policemen to Echandia to show them "his" office. Nothing further came of the encounter, though when it came to the Project administrators' attention, it served as a forewarning that adequate liaison would have to be established and maintained with the police forces patrolling the area.

Soon thereafter, a second episode involving the Project and the police occurred. An old man, apparently very drunk, staggered into the Halfway Houses, where several Project workers were temporarily located. One of the field workers found that the man could not speak English, so he quickly summoned a Mexican-American ex-addict by telephone. The man then relayed the information that he had been assaulted, and asked that an ambulance be called. At this point, two police officers entered the building and placed the man under arrest. The field workers protested, but to no avail.

This incident was discussed at some length during later training sessions, and Project administrators took the viewpoint that the workers had shown admirable discretion in "keeping their cool" during the episode involving the old man and the police. The workers readily accepted this interpretation, which was put forward in terms of a necessary kind of behavior if the Project were to expect to survive. There were no later incidents of any note between the police and the Project, and relationships at the end of the first eighteen months were described by the research observers as "excellent." The police made it clear that the Project was existing on their sufferance, and that it could quickly be destroyed if its work became objectionable or was viewed as detrimental to enforcement tactics for dealing with the narcotics situation. The Project accepted this view, and took pains to operate within the definitional limits implicitly enunciated by the police.

Early Experiences in the Field -- The classroom and group discussion phase of the first training sessions soon gave way to activities designed to simulate more directly experiences that the workers would be apt to have when they began to deal with clients in the community. For this purpose, the workers were divided into four-person teams, and instructed to drive through the streets of East Los Angeles to gain familiarity with the area they would be working. During these tours they were also expected to locate former or practicing addicts and to explain the Project to them. At the end of the day, each group was to file a report outlining its activities. Later, these reports would form the basis for further discussion regarding problems encountered and their proposed solutions.

The day-long cruises through the neighborhoods provided considerable insight into the anxieties the field workers were experiencing about the nature of their job. For one thing, they were intent upon getting started, upon doing something, and the orientation delay made them nervous. For another, they appeared uncertain concerning the reception they might receive in the community and the success they might have in assuming new roles.

These uncertainties are revealed in the report of a researcher who accompanied a group of field workers on one of their exploratory ventures during the training period. At first, there was resistance to his inclusion in the group, stated on the grounds that "They [possible clients] are going to think you're a narco for sure - then we won't be able to get close to them." Finally, however, the workers agreed to take the researcher with them, providing he remained inconspicuous.

The group first went to the home of a woman whose son was shortly to be released from the California Rehabilitation Center, the state's civil commitment facility for narcotic addicts. The workers took turns telling the woman about themselves and their backgrounds, and assuring her that they had each experienced the same problems as her son, and that they could help him, if he sought them out after his release. She appeared interested, listening closely. When the workers left, one of them summed up her feelings to the researcher: "This was too easy. Wait until we have to deal with an addict."

The group proceeded to cruise through the area until about three o'clock, at which time the leader said, "Let's not make any more home calls today. Most Mexicans are eating at this time and we shouldn't disturb them." One of the group had to report for a Nalline test, a condition of his parole, and was dropped off at the testing center, while the remaining two stopped for a beer. They were particularly interested in the researcher's attitude toward what they had accomplished during the day. When they returned to their headquarters, the leader attacked a form indicating the day's activities, an undertaking to which he was not accustomed and which give him no small amount of difficulty. Another member of the group, standing nearby, complained about the touring, saying that he felt he could make more profitable use of his time by sticking close to the Project center and "trolling for addicts" or working with addicts who had been referred for assistance.

Similar complaints - seemingly reflecting bohh eagerness and uncertainty - were voiced by many workers regarding what they defined as meaningless meanderings about the area. The workers were also anxious about the prospects that they could assist potential clients. At a meeting during this period, a field worker noted: "We don't have anything to offer these people. Even if we find an addict, what can we tell him? We don't have any brochures or facilities for dry-out, we can't go to agencies, and so forth. We aren't performing our function in the community."

A supervisor tried to alleviate the concern by indicating that the workers were being unnecessarily premature in their concerns; noting:

> You were selected as a group leader because you know the territory. Your job now is to acquaint your workers with the neighborhood they have to work in. If you have done that, you are doing your job. We don't have the facilities at this point to do anything more than this. The Project is not yet underway. When we get going, then you can get out on the streets.

The workers' feeling that they lacked identity and direction was partly alleviated by the distribution of identification cards shortly thereafter, and by the move into the new building. But the concern about the absence of drying-out facilities, necessary to detoxify clients, was to grow into a major Project issue.

The first clear indication of the problem came on September 19, when the field workers made contact with two addicts requesting detoxification. None of the administrators could be found for the moment, however, they were quickly located and the workers registered the two sick men in a local hotel and an around-the-clock schedule of "baby-sitters" was arranged so that somebody would always be with the men. These first two men heralded a veritable flood-tide of clients interested in detoxification, a matter for which the Project had neither money nor facilities. The detoxification issue became one of such fundamental importance in the development of the Project that it will be discussed in greater detail in a separate section of this report.

Other early activities of the Project workers included the establishment of contacts with local service agencies and with judges responsible for handling narcotics cases. In the latter instance, the workers visited judges before whom they had appeared, explained the aims of the Project, and asked for help in regard to cases which might come before them where the defendant was a Project client. Initial reactions tended to be skeptical; later, the Project received considerable assistance from community agencies and the judiciary, particularly since neither group had many resources which they could utilize for dealing with addicts.

Workers were also asked to speak to civil and professional groups throughout the County. The excitement of having a forum and an audience soon gave place to some weariness at the incessant demands for presentations. Several of the field workers proved to be extraordinarily able public speakers, and testimonials expressing appreciation for their work (see Appendix C for samples) arrived at Project offices regularly. With the establishment of the Narcotic Information Service toward the end of the year, however, that agency was assigned to handle all such requests. For the Project, the arrangement was more than satisfactory because some unease had begun to appear regarding the inordinate time demands involved in public appearances.

Morale during the first months of the Project appeared to the researchers to be extremely high, despite the cramped working conditions under which the Project was being run. The first personnel crisis in fact, seemed to draw the remainder of the workers closer together, acting out a tradition they were supposed to have learned in correctional institutions, a tradition of group responsibility for individual difficulty. The workers attempted to provide assistance to a colleague who appeared to be "slipping" by coming to work late and missing work days. They offered to listen to his "problems" and to make whatever efforts they could to relieve the obvious tension under which he was operating. For his part, the man rebuffed offers of assistance and suggested that marital problems were totally responsible for his situation. Three weeks after the first appearance of difficulty, he was fired from the Project, and ultimately he was returned to the civil commitment facility on the basis of further use of narcotics.

Interviews with the Project administrators at this point indicated their guarded enthusiasm about developments. "Things were going as well as could be expected," they said. They believed the field workers were concentrating too much attention on drying out addicts and too little on the prevention of addiction through work with persons who needed supports of some kind to maintain themselves in the community in a drug-abstinent condition. The field workers were also seen as showing too little discrimination in their "recruitment" patterns. One had brought twenty-five practicing addicts onto Project roles during the first month of operation, virtually all of whom were seen as self-evident "losers". On the other hand, the administrators were encouraged by particular instances in which Project initiative appeared to be paying dividends. One worker, for example, had approached three youngsters he found in a park smoking marijuana and drinking wine and told them about the services the Project offered. The next day all three appeared for pre-arranged appointments and two were immediately placed on jobs, while the third was reported to have gone back to school.

Considerable early resistance had already become manifest, however, regarding the necessity of completing mileage forms and daily activity work sheets. For many of the workers, complying with such requirements was a strenuous effort and for them - as for their innumerable fellow-sufferers in the bureaucratic world - the forms seems to be a senseless undertaking detracting from the amount of time and energy available for what they regarded as more meaningful kinds of work.

Meanwhile, interviews continued to be held with prospective candidates for Project field worker positions. A screening committee made up entirely of field workers met periodically to evaluate applicants. The research worker, attending several sessions, was unable to discern any rationale by which they were run. At one session, six persons were interviewed by five field workers. Questions were asked each applicant regarding his personal history of narcotics use, his knowledge of the geographic area and of the addicts residing in it, and his acquaintance with various people in the "joint" [prison]. The hiring committee also usually requested the applicant's views regarding legalization of marijuana.

The applicant was given a rating by members of the committee after completion of his interview, but the final discussions of the candidates tended to concentrate on other than their performance under questioning. One of the supervisors, for instance, suggested that they did not need to hire additional Mexican or Negro men, but that they should concentrate on employing a suitable Mexican "broad" [female]. A review of the ratings made by the field workers showed that they tended to be consistently low. Ultimately, one of the six persons interviewed was hired, though he had received a very poor overall rating by the committee. To the researcher's mind, the final decision had been influenced by the fact that the man had provided his car and given a good deal of his time to activities of the Narcotics Symposium group, members of which were still clearly in positions of some control in the Project. The search for the Mexican "broad" finally resulted in the hiring, several weeks later, of a girl who could not speak Spanish. Shortly after this, the hiring decisions were taken over by the non-addict field coordinator and one of the ex-addict supervisors.

The research inquiry conducted among field workers at the six-week point in the Project's progress asked, among other things, for an enunciation of Project goals might best be achieved. Most of the responses were very general. One worker, still suspicious of the entire enterprise, noted: "I'm not sure what the goals are. Who knows, there may be some conspiracy to watch us to see what happens. You don't even know if this room isn't bugged right now." Most of the responses focused on detoxification and "resocialization" as the major aims of Project work, and indicated general satisfaction that progress was slowly being made toward an adequate program. Complaints repeatedly focused on the lack of funds to operate a detoxification facility and the excessive red tape and paper work.

Respondents were also asked to rate their fellow workers in terms of their enthusiasm for the Project. Nearly all responses indicated high level of morale at this point in the Project. One worker noted: "I know for myself that it's a beautiful experience. For once in my life I'm beginning to care - to feel - for someone else. I think everybody feels that way." Another had the following observation about his colleagues: "They surprised the hell out of me. At first I thought they all just saw dollar signs - you know, a nice easy job. But they're really sincere - knocking themselves out."

The final question dealt with the worker's attitudes toward the Project leadership. Here the answers were more equivocal. Negative comments included: "I don't think they're very organized and the communication down to us is terrible"; "They have a lot to learn, I feel they have a 'we-they' attitude. I also know that they are frustrated but they shouldn't kill morale all the way down the line"; "They are capable, but they don't communicate with us. They don't know how to handle people. They mean well, I guess, but everybody isn't a leader. You can't make a general out of a corporal." Among the more positive comments were the following: "There's real trust here between the leaders and the rest of us and real concern from the front office"; "At first, I wondered about their motives, but they're all doing good jobs"; and "They're really human. They're not Establishment, you know."

In summary, it would appear reasonable to say that the Project had survived its shakedown period in rather good condition. The training period, in the judgment of the field workers, had not been a particular success, but it may be presumed that it had accomplished some introductory tasks that, of necessity in so pioneering and novel a venture, would be tedious and at times disconcerting. Most of the workers had become (or remained) quite enthusiastic about the Project and their part in it; others, disenchanted, had become more certain of their views and soon resigned.

In regard to the hierarchical structure of the Project even the views favorable to the leadership clearly indicate that a clear distinction had been drawn between the non-addict administrators and the ex-addict field workers and that there was no question where most of the power lay. For some, this development was untoward; for others, it might be viewed as a necessary and realistic condition for the proper evolvement of Project work. A major consequence was that the ex-addict supervisor, who had provided the force which translated the Narcotics Symposium blueprint into the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project, shortly found himself in direct conflict with the administrators. He accused them of undermining his ideas, assuming too much power, and losing sight of the ideals of an indigenous operation. They accused him of grandstanding, involving a preference for show rather than performance, some diffuse lechery, irresponsibility, and an overbearing attitude toward other field workers. There was no question, in the ensuing showdown, where the power lay. The supervisor was stripped of his position and higher salary and told to take on field work duties. He refused, tendered his resignation, and for a time thereafter, threatened to expose the Project's waywardness to the mass media and to take other retaliatory steps. Ultimately, he drifted out of Project sight, reportedly still drug-abstinent, the Project remaining as a testament, however (from his view) distorted, of his original ideas and ambitions.

Community Reactions to the Project -- A first task assigned to the family counselor was to aid the assistant director in canvassing the immediate neighborhood in an attempt to explain the Project to residents and to head off incipient resentments about its location in their midst. Boyle Heights, in contrast to more affluent, more self-righteous, more insecure and, probably, more concerned communities had always been notoriously apathetic to stimuli, such as the location of facilities for addicts in their midst, which would invariably elicit howls of protest when placed in other locales. In part, a large number of the residents were outwardly-focused, intent upon earning their way out of the area into more suburban neighborhoods. In large measure, the political and commercial leaders lived elsewhere in the city so that facilities such as the Project were no personal threat to them. Only four of more than several hundred persons contacted, voiced any objection to the location of the Project.

Very shortly, however, the local weekly newspaper banner headlined that it would OPPOSE NARCOTICS REHABILITATION HOUSE ON BRITTANIA, Brittania being the street adjacent to Project headquarters, where efforts were being made to establish a detoxification center. A petition was circulated against the Project and in December the Project administration was asked by a group which called itself "The Irate Citizens Committee" to discuss grievances.

The Committee had indicated that it would marshall some 200 aggrieved persons for the confrontation, but only 15 appeared. The Project administrator, attempting to respond to inquiries, most of them hostile, was continually interrupted. One interrogator wanted to know why a narcotics center, instead of a music center, was being established. They accused the Project of "deceiving" them by "sneaking" into the neighborhood, and pointed out that its location was within short distance of three grade schools, that it therefore threatened the well-being of the children, particularly since it would attract addicts to the vicinity.

The meeting ended angrily, but, as with so many things of such a nature, in the history of East Los Angeles, the opposition dissipated, a victim of its own inability to mount an effective campaign. For the remainder of the Project's first year, objections expressed to it were rare, settling on annoyance with trash distributed in the neighborhood, the lack of parking space because of the workers' presence, and the appearance of "suspicious looking" persons who were "hanging around" in front of the Center.

Beginning of Group Therapy Sessions -- The Project began operating on a 24-hour, 7 day-a-week basis in mid-October. Workers had been asked to state their preferences for schedules, but in practice the undesirable shifts - graveyard and swing - went to those whose work had been judged to be less satisfactory to this time. Ultimately, client traffic indicated that it was unnecessary to keep the headquarters open throughout the entire night and on week-ends, and the working hours were rearranged to 8:30 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Organizational lines and procedures also began to harden, epitomized perhaps most clearly by the appearance of a large blackboard which, as in probation and parole offices, indicated which of the workers was in the office and which out in the field, and when each person was expected to return to headquarters.

Group therapy sessions, planned as an integral part of the Project program, also got underway in mid-October. A consultant worked with the ex-addicts one day a week to train them in the techniques of group counseling and to evaluate the progress of their work. The group leaders from the Project had had considerable experience with the techniques of counseling employed in various California correctional institutions, and it was this experiential background, plus clues picked up from the consultant, that constituted their working background. In the same manner that other forms of non-addict expertise were derogated in the Project blueprint, the psychological foundations of therapy were regarded as superfluous, if not harmful. The folk knowledge of the group leaders and their personalities were presumed to be more meaningful than the theories of Freud, Jung, and Moreno.

A research interview with the group therapy consultant, late in December, found him still unsatisfied with the way this segment of the program had progressed. A number of groups had been set up - including an adult addict group, a married couples group, a youth group, a group comprising inmates of one of the nearby correctional facilities, a group concentrating on issues of employment, and several additional groups drawing their participants from residents in a nearby housing project. There was, however, no systematic attempt to keep track of participation in the groups or to determine whether individuals involved were Project clients. Attendance of the group leaders at the consultant-run training sessions was erratic, partly, the consultant believed, because of inexpert scheduling of the workers' time by Project administrators, and partly because of the workers' own disinterest in the training program. The consultant self-critically also, thought that the content of the programs had not been attractive enough to arouse and maintain worker interest and participation.

Whenever possible, two workers shared the responsibilities for conducting the group counseling sessions because of the consultants' view that their interaction provided enhanced opportunity for group control and for more effective evaluation of the ingredients of the various sessions. Some, but very few, rules governed the sessions themselves; for example, no one could come to the groups loaded or drunk. Size was limited to ten persons, though as few as two or three regular participants was deemed enough to justify continuation of the group meetings. All groups were expected to terminate in three month's time, based on the consultant's conviction that explicit time boundaries were essential for group efficiency in reaching some resolution. As in most such programs, the content of the group discussions, which lasted from one to one and a half hours, one night a week, were supposed to be determined by members of the group itself.

Little is known regarding the efficacy of the group counseling programs. Presumably, by their very existence, they aided some persons in overcoming loneliness, resolving problems bothering them, and getting specific kinds of information about things such as employment. It is possible too, of course, that they accomplished little or nothing and had detrimental effects. Research workers were requested not to attend the meetings on the ground that their presence as presumably disinterested parties would disturb the proper functioning of group procedures. It was requested that the group leaders complete forms indicating the number of persons present at each session and the situations discussed, but these forms, when done, were generally laconic and uninformative.

In addition, there was considerable resistance to the group therapy program from field workers and clients who carried over a dislike of such procedures from programs they had participated in within correctional facilities. They were, in their words, "grouped out," and saw neither the relevance nor the value of the programs. At the end of the first year of the Project, the group counseling programs had become relatively stabilized, with attendance at specialized groups high and regular, and field worker adeptness in the processes considerably improved. There was nothing to suggest that this segment of the program was not useful, but nothing either, unfortunately, to demonstrate the accuracy of this view.

Relations with Correctional Agencies -- The Project's relationships with the California Department of Corrections proved to be one of its unexpectedly strong points. The Department had been strong in its endorsement of the Boyle Heights Project from the early phases of its planning, but it had not been anticipated that a relationship would emerge which would draw so large a number of clients to the Project, men and women seeking effective intervention between themselves as isolated individuals and the power of the state agency.

The largest percentage of the Project clients proved to be under some form of correctional supervision at the time they made contact with the field workers. Their situation often was delicate. It was quite clear at the outset that the Project could not thrive, or perhaps even survive, if it chose to serve as the handmaiden of the parole authorities, locating and turning over to correctional authorities, persons who had absconded or who were found to be using drugs. On the other hand, it was equally evident to the Project administrators that they could not exist totally oblivious to the client's official status and correctional concerns about him. The compromise made between the two demands seemed, though with some exceptions, to serve the requirements of the clients, the Project, and the correctional agencies. When the Project made contact with a prospective client, he was asked to indicate his correctional status. If he were on parole, it was explained to him that it was essential that his agent be informed before further efforts on his behalf could be undertaken. If he was not interested in such arrangements, he was allowed to depart without further action being taken. If he decided to remain, the Project would intervene as strenuously as possible between the man and strict interpretation of regulations. In most cases, correctional authorities were willing to make concessions to Project clients - such as reinstating them in the good graces of the parole office - if the Project said that it would work with the client thereafter. By the end of December, it was reported that the Project had, in fact, located more PAL's (absconders from parole, or parolees-at-large) during the previous month, than all of the parole agents in the state of California.

Relations were not so effective between the Project and the authorities responsible for the state's civil commitment program for narcotic addicts. All civil commitment cases coming to Project attention who were in violation of parole conditions automatically had to be returned to the California Rehabilitation Center when reported to state officials.

An arrangement reached in February, allowing the Project to retain CRC clients, even if they had used drugs, proved short-lived. It was maintained by the state officials that a field worker had harbored a CRC case without notifying the authorities and that the Project had detoxified another man without first acquiring permission to do so from the man's parole agent. In the first instance, the worker was suspended for two weeks, pending an investigation of the charges, until the Project administrators decided that the evidence did not substantiate it. In the second case, the Project maintained that the field worker had in fact, received permission to proceed with detoxification. Working relations were never reestablished with CRC officials, though, ironically, more CRC clients - 82 percent - than persons in other statutes had proven successful in completing the detoxification process at the Project kicking pad.

Drug Use and Field Workers -- By December, according to the observations of the research workers, the entire operation of the Project had become "more efficient and more effective." Workers were beginning to grasp with more clarity what was expected of them, and administrators were simultaneously relaxing controls in non-essential areas and tightening them in areas which had previously been marked by some laxity and confusion. Clearcut policies were also beginning to emerge.

An open-house was held at the Center on November 28, attended by more than 300 persons, including many police officers, social workers, and correctional officials, as well as residents and authorities in the Boyle Heights community. Guests were conducted through the Center, and questions were answered regarding the program.

The first major crisis involving personal drug use by a field worker occurred in late December, when a urinalysis test on a worker indicated that he was taking amphetamines. The Project staff had a categoric rule that any worker found to be using drugs would be summarily dismissed. Each worker received two surprise urinalysis tests each month to enable the Project administrators to determine if the staff was abstaining from drug use. In this manner, it was possible to respond to public inquiries about the drug status of the workers, and to derive some indication of the success of the Project in keeping its employees drug free.

The positive urinalysis, indicating amphetamine use, was that of one of the most dedicated and hard-working field workers on the Project staff. He had carried most of the detoxification load, scrounging money and supplies for an impromptu "kicking pad" and donating his own home as the detoxification center. He readily admitted amphetamine use, saying that he had taken them because he had become very fatigued under the demands of operating the detoxification program.

The Project administrators equivocated momentarily, suggesting that everyone shared part of the blame for the worker's relapse by not assisting him in ways that he had requested for support of the detoxification program. Finally, however, it was decided to adhere to the original rules, and fire the worker, with the stipulation that he could be re-employed at a future time if he demonstrated that he could stay away from drugs. The remaining field workers were divided in their reactions to the decision. "Bennies ain't nothing," one of them indicated. On the other hand, a number of workers felt that any relaxation of the Project rules would introduce too much uncertainty into the lives of the field workers. Re-hiring the terminated field worker, it was said, "would be a real mistake."

The following was the content of this particular view; held in some degree by about half of the Project field workers:

> If they do that, then everything the program stands for goes down the drain. The clients won't believe in us anymore. We'd lose our reputation here with clients. We are supposed to be drug-free and that means exactly that. If we can't stay drug free, we shouldn't be hired on the Project. I am very much against him ever being re-hired. And that doesn't mean that I don't like him or anything else. I think he has done a great job.

The man was re-hired, however, several months later. His subsequent performance never came up to the level that it had been at prior to his termination and he finally resigned from the Project, claiming that the salary paid him did not allow him to support his family adequately.

A second test of the Project regulation came only a week later, when another worker had a positive urinalysis test, this time one indicating that he had used morphine. The man flatly denied the accuracy of the result, maintaining that the sloppy and haphazard manner in which the specimen bottles were handled might have led to the reported result. Project administrators delayed their decision for three weeks, and finally decided to retain the employee, accepting his version of the situation.

Some field workers commented subsequently that they now felt they could "get away with anything on this Project, just short of using stuff." The worker in question continued working for the duration of the Project, and passed all of his subsequent tests, lending credence to his claims. The administrators of the Project, in the view of the research workers, continued to have difficulties throughout the year, interpreting and applying the basic edict that any kind of drug use would automatically terminate the worker's association with the Project.

The research workers attempted to interview all field workers who terminated employment in order to obtain their views on their departure. A number indicated that a certain disenchantment with the Project had led to their decision to leave. A not unusual comment was the following:

> It's that communication thing between the staff and the clients. We get too many people running around giving out faulty information in the community about what services we have to offer and this kind of thing. The staff never seems to find out what the administration is doing and vice versa. They have that "we-they" thing going, and I think it is a result of the administration not being willing to make decisions and discuss things. There is too much secrecy.

Others quit because of pressures brought upon them regarding the quality of their work and some were fired because of poor work records. In this regard, too, the administrators tended to warn first, cajole some, and offer every opportunity for reform before letting a worker go. Some workers interpreted these procedures as encouragement to poor performances. As one of them put the matter:

> They're just too lax around here. You know, addicts really do need supervision. That's not just an old wive's tale. I know. I've been around them. I've been one. You know, I get to feeling guilty with so much freedom. It is so easy to just drive out of the Center here and forget about it, go home, drink, do whatever you want all day long and then come back and sign in at night. Nobody knows the difference and, you know, that's a real big temptation to a lot of these people, and I don't think it's right. I don't think they should give us that much freedom. You've got to sit on an addict more. He has got to have more direction and it will work better for all concerned . . . I believe in the Project and want it to work. I want to continue this kind of work, but you've got to give me more supervision.

Another worker noted: "There's a lot of goofing off going on. These people go home and watch television and then come back and check out and things like that."

The workers' comments, quoted above, seemed to the researchers less significant for their overt content than for their implications. That some of the former addicts could be morally indignant and rather guilty about the trust being placed in them, the opportunities for deceit so blatantly allowed them, and the transgressions of some of their fellows obviously might be regarded as a considerably "healthier" note than routinized adherence to job specifications carried out under constant surveillance.

It was evident, however, that the field workers were becoming more cynical about addicts as they approached them from the framework of social service personnel. One worker had a tape recorder and a radio stolen from him by a client, and complained vociferously to other staff members about the "unreliability" of drug addicts. He received no sympathy; he should have known, his colleagues said with some scorn, that addicts were not to be trusted.

There were also periodic bursts of enthusiasm about individual experiences of success which often turned sour shortly thereafter when the client relapsed. Some workers, however, held on tenaciously to produce results that seemed to be directly attributable to their intervention, and the pleasure they secured from such work was obvious. One field worker, for instance, became involved with a youngster, who had begun heavy drug use at the age of 15. The worker spent a number of hours with the boy each week, trying to talk him out of drug use, usually without much success. After a while, however, the boy began to use drugs less often, and by the end of the first year of the Project, still a client, he had radically reduced his recourse to drugs. In the same vein, another field worker commented on one of his cases in the following terms:

> You know, when he first came out - I knew him in the joint - he wasn't going to do anything. He wasn't even going to register or nothing. I went down and got him registered, got him squared away. His parole officer wouldn't even talk to him; you know, he didn't think he would make it for a.month. I got him this job; he never dreamed he could get a job like that. I got him this job through CEP, you know, the New Careers program. And he is working out just great. It's incredible the change this guy has made; he's a tremendous success. He's my shining example, and now the parole agent likes him too and uses him as a showboat. You know, he becomes the great example for others. And that's what's so amazing. I have seen the agent go from hating him to really digging him in three month's time.

The details of another worker's experiences with a client provide some flavor of the kind of work that was undertaken with clients:

> You know, he'd suck me dry if I gave him the chance. So I put some pressure on him. Like that check deal, where he was afraid to go and cash the check at the bank. I told him there's the bus, man. Go do it. But he was afraid to go to the goddamn bank even when the check is good. So I explained the whole thing to him and told him how it is. I talked to his old lady and she says, you know, she doesn't want anything to do with him. So I go back and tell him just as honestly as I could. He is finally ready at this point, to get a job. I have carried him this far without it. He couldn't have handled a job before. I think I have gotten him now to the point where he can. I mean, this guy wouldn't even take a bus by himself before. He was afraid to do anything on his own. I'll get him squared away though, I think he is going to do a good job when he does get one.

This story is not without its own intense irony, an irony that provides something of a commentary on the unpredicted and seemingly unpredictable turns and twists in the fates of both workers and clients. The client depicted in the foregoing comments by the field worker obtained several jobs through the Project and performed well on them. He did so well in fact, that he was offered and accepted a job as a field worker with the Project. Meanwhile, the field worker who had handled his case had himself returned to drug use and been fired from his job.

Later Program Changes -- Late in February, in response to gaps in services, there was a wide-sweeping reorganization of the Project staffing pattern. First, a position of Orientation Specialist was created, making concrete an informal procedure that had evolved earlier in the Project. The Orientation Specialist was charged with interviewing all new clients and explaining to them the services which they could take advantage of and the requirements that they would be expected to meet.

The second change involved the creation of a category of workers who handled new clients who, for 30 days, would remain in a probationary status. Following this period, depending upon an evaluation of his situation, and upon his continuation with Project activities, he would be placed with a field worker as part of his regular caseload. The alternative was to put the client on suspended status, until such time as he showed greater interest in the Project or the worker was able to establish better contact with him. If a client was arrested or left the jurisdiction, his case was also put into the suspended category or, if the situation appeared to warrant it, the case file was marked closed.

Finally, it was at about this time that extramural bickering between persons sympathetic to the Narcotic Symposium program and those beginning to favor an emerging organization came to a head. At a meeting of the Symposium group in April, a number of Mexican-American field workers and several other Mexican-Americans who were not employed in the Project walked out of the session, claiming that they did not have adequate representation on the Symposium Board of Directors. They established their own group, called LUCHA (League of United Citizens to Help Addicts). Existence of the new group further splintered the allegiances of the Project staff, particularly when LUCHA began to take the position that the Project, rather than merely helping addicts should inculcuate them with ideas of political militancy, since it was the relative powerlessness of the Mexican-American group and other groups from which addiction seemed to emerge that was most directly associated with the use of drugs. Ultimately, some workers left the Project because of the rift, though most managed to find their individual ways between the requirements of Project work and affiliation with LUCHA, the Symposium, or non-affiliated existence.

Overall View of Field Work Performance -- Variations in the quality of performance by the field workers ran a wide range. Some of the workers, during the periodic reviews of their caseloads, were unable to provide information regarding the current status of most of their clients and had evidently been handling their work in slipshod fashion. Other workers conversely, were more than carrying a reasonable share of the Project's total work load. All told, the Project was providing some service on a rather steady basis for approximately 300 persons each month and at least some service for probably 100 to 200 additional persons each month who could not be followed up for one reason or another; perhaps, for example, because they could not be located a second time or because they declined further offers of assistance.

The need for services such as those offered by the Project would perhaps best be gauged by the number of persons seeking it out. Almost from the moment it opened, the detoxification facility was filled to capacity (five persons) with clients attempting to eliminate, at least momentarily their physical dependence upon drugs. The Project headquarters too, appeared to be a beehive of activity most times, with addicts, ex-addicts, and their relatives seeking one or another kind of assistance.

At the same time, the number of clients is at best only a superficial measure of the value of the Project, since the quantity of services provides no insight into their quality. Some workers, for instance, would spend a week or the better part of a week assisting a single client to obtain a job, smoothe out a family situation, or untangle snarles in his parole status. Other clients, seen with relatively infrequency, were not offered services more regularly on the presumption that, at least for the moment, they had their lives and their drug condition under adequate control. Nonetheless, it was a Project objective to maintain at least some contact with all persons listed on the record as clients, unless the client himself desired to terminate the relationship.

At the end of the first year, as the more detailed analyses which follow indicate, the Project appeared to be functioning with considerable success as an intervening force between addicts and the social forces which seemed to be related to their use of drugs. Given the pioneering nature of the venture, the degree of organization and structure that was able to be formed in the first year seemed, at least to the research workers following the Project's progress, quite remarkable. In essence, a previously voiceless group had been provided with an intermediary force, patently partisan, to fight some of their battles with agencies seen as impersonal on occasion, as hostile and discriminatory.

IV. JOB DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Placing persons who sought work into jobs was regarded as a crucial element of the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project. Various kinds of assistance directed toward alleged psychic inadequacies of the men and women seeking assistance were offered, but it was seen as fundamental to achieving a drug-abstinent condition that the client have a job and be able to anticipate a regular income from his work.

The employment problems of the men seeking out the Project or brought to it by the field workers were considerable. They often had long histories of drug use, and as a group they had a reputation, not altogether undeserved, of making inconstant employees, apt not only to do poor work because of relapse to drugs but also on occasion likely to exploit their employer in order to obtain the wherewithal to purchase drugs. Added to their drug use records, the men had usually served time in prison, and carried that stigma into the employment market. In addition, the Project clients were predominantly Mexican-Americans. In many instances, they had difficulties with English, few marketable skills, and little education. They also had to contend with the discrimination against Mexican-Americans that marks social relationships throughout the southwest.

Persons in charge of the job placement program for the Project operated on a constant "emergency" basis. The staff believed, from substantial experience, that the period immediately following release from prison is a particularly precarious one for a person with a history of narcotic usage, and efforts were made to provide as substantial a number of "positive" ingredients for the individual as possible, as quickly as possible. Otherwise, left to his own devices, it was felt that the ex-addict would be apt to slip back to drug use.

The Job Development workers in the Project initially outlined their goals in the following terms:

1. To contact employers for the purpose of obtaining job offers;

2. To contact labor unions for the purpose of encouraging extension of membership to ex-convicts and drug users;

3. To contact other self-help organizations for the purpose of coordinating efforts in the area of job development and training for ex-convicts and drug users;

4. To contact all other public and private agencies, including the local Office of Economic Opportunity, for the purpose of developing resources to serve the needs of Project clients;

5. To assist in the development and presentation of seminars, workshops, or other educational Project activities to enlighten the general public and potential employers about Project activities and requirements;

6. To develop and implement a systematic follow-up procedure to determine the progress and problems occurring as a result of individual job placements;

7. To advise people served by the Project in the basics of employment seeking, job readiness, and similar matters.

Only one ex-addict was assigned to the job development work at the outset of the project work, but it very quickly became evident that he could not handle the load alone, and another man was soon hired to provide assistance. The two men given the task as job developers remained in charge of this segment of Project work throughout the year, and their personalities and philosophies left an indelible imprint upon procedures. Both consistently demonstrated a strong identification with their clients, sharing their impatience with the indifference and discrimination of the business world against the underdog. Both had had considerable experience with an agency known as HELP, a local grass-roots organization which sought employment for ex-convicts. Each man, therefore, brought to the Project a backlog of contacts with employers, union leaders, and various community agencies which had indicated in the past some willingness to deal with "hard-core" clients.

The Job Development Office was consistently the busiest spot in the Project. A third man and several part-time youth workers had to be added to the staff by the end of the first year. The Job Office was often crowded with clients waiting for job counseling and placement, and it was estimated that about 80 percent of the clients coming to Project headquarters were there seeking employment leads.

Job placement procedures -- The goals outlined above had to be compromised at several points in the face of the heavy demands placed upon the Job Development section. The most immediate and critical task was seen as putting men into jobs; other elements of the operation were regarded as tangential to this and were neglected or dropped when they were seen as cutting into placement demands. The heavy workload, for instance, made it impossible to make systematic checks on the job progress of clients placed. Clients were asked to report back to the Project regarding the outcome of their job interviews, and to keep in touch with the Job Development Section from time to time, but their performance in this area was sporadic and unreliable. To the Job Development workers it seemed less important to push in this area than to see to it that additional persons were given opportunities to obtain jobs. Similarly, the idea of beginning a training program in which clients would be taught strategies related to finding and keeping jobs fell by the wayside shortly after the program began, a victim of understaffing and client apathy. Clients wanted jobs, not lectures, and the Job Development Section consistently responded to this demand, one with which the workers were in fundamental agreement. The task of extending and expanding contacts with employers, a key element in the blueprint of the Job Development Section, also fell victim to more pressing considerations, and such contacts tended to be restricted to discussions on specific job openings.

Most of the initially high expectations centered on the use of other social service agencies in the area as sources of job referrals were unrealized as the year progressed. Both men in the Job Development Section, as noted, had personal contacts with the local labor unions, the State employment service, and government-funded training and employment programs. With few exceptions, however, these agencies began to be viewed by the Job Developers as too indifferent to the Project's requirements and too bureaucratic, more concerned with the niceties of paperwork than with the needs of one-time addicts.

The Mexican-American Opportunity Foundation, for example, a federally-funded agency dedicated to obtaining jobs for Mexican-Americans, was criticized by the Job Developers for refusing to lie about a client's background or to place a client into a job viewed as substandard. At the outset of the Project, the Concentrated Employment Program, a federal agency for "sub-professional" training was a major outlet for Project clients seeking work, but within a few months the Job Developers abandoned their reliance upon it, maintaining that it was ineffectual because of long delays in initial interviewing and testing. Such delays were seen as too anxiety-provoking for job-seeking addicts, who would return to drug use rather than sit out the intervals between appointments. By the end of the year, the Section had all but abandoned the Concentrated Employment Program as a source of jobs.

Generally speaking, then, community agencies proved of little assistance to the Job Developers. There were a few exceptions to this rule, but in such cases success, as defined by the Developers, proved possible only because close personal contacts with individuals in those agencies allowed procedural barriers to be sidestepped.

The bulk of successful placements were increasingly made through direct contact with employers. The previous affiliation of the Job Developers with HELP enabled them to begin their work with a backlog of cooperative employers. Additional employer contacts were made in the course of the first year, but the majority of successful relationships remained within these original contacts. It is estimated that more than 500 companies were approached, but only about 20 of these provided a consistent supply of job openings. Most were small manufacturing and maintenance firms, such as garment factories, machine shops, roofing companies, and sheet-metal shops, offering jobs of an unskilled or semi-skilled nature.

A dominant feature of the Section's operation has been suggested; that is, its rejection of the standard niceties of the protocol observed in most employment agencies. The Job Developers always insisted that the client, not the employer, was their first concern. They were more willing than most agencies to jeopardize relations with employers in order to place an addict on a job. They defined the addict-employer relationship as a particular case of the general antagonism between the interests of the "system" and the disenfranchised poor, especially the Mexican-Americans. "Most of the employers are bigots anyway," one of the Job Developers maintained. The problem of finding a job was viewed as "beating the system" and clients were advised to exaggerate their virtues ("to come on middle-class and respectable") to prospective employers and to lie about their past. Job Developers on occasion would telephone an employer using the name of the client, ask for a job, and fabricate an attractive autobiography - while the client sat by and listened. The Section leader once lamented that many of the Project clients would never get ahead simply because they did not know how to lie well. "You've got to out-cheat the cheaters," he explained. "This job is turning me into the world's biggest liar." The Job Developers estimated that 75 percent of their placements were made under false pretenses.

Throughout the year of research observation, the priority of concern for clients remained dominant within the Job Development Section. It was not unusual for a

Job Developer to spend an afternoon accompanying a client to his interview with a prospective employer, in order to plead the client's case. Not surprisingly, the perceived necessity for a cavalier regard for the truth often alienated employers. The long-run inefficiency of these practices was recognized by the Job Developers, but was chalked up to a built-in dilemma of the Project itself: the choice between bureaucratic efficiency and personalized and humane concern for individual clients.

Job Placement Results -- An attempt to assess quantitatively the success of the job placement operation is fraught with problems. Employment success is, in any case, a difficult concept to operationalize. It may, for instance, be a function of nothing other than procedural matters, so that an agency which attempts to place only the most promising clients will show on paper a much better success rate than one which dedicates its efforts to assisting all comers. The characteristics of the Project's clients combined with the Job Developer's commitment to them, undercuts any attempt to offer meaningful comparative measures of success. In addition, the absence of follow-ups serves to make even more uncertain numerical statements about the efficacy of the job placement operation. The Section's own files, a chief source of such information, are something less than models of scrupulous precision and thoroughness, as befits a staff with deep-seated anti-bureaucratic values.

To inquire simply whether clients were employed or not following their contact with the Job Development Section, merely scratches the surface of the evaluation problem. A far more penetrating and meaningful inquiry concerns the improvement of the clients' general employment situation. In the "economic underworld,"* - that sector of the urban poor which fights cyclical bouts of unemployment and underemployment, and attempts to cope with seasonal and underpaid job opportunities - a job is often viewed as a temporary stopgap condition rather than as a lifetime career and source of regular income. When asked if it was true that any addict willing and able to work could find a job, the Job Developers replied in the affirmative: If one were willing to accept a degrading job without fringe benefits or opportunities for advancement, with a high risk of layoff and a salary of $60.00 per week. Thus a meaningful measurement of the success of the employment program, as in other features of the Project effort, must take into account the precarious and vulnerable condition of addicts and their limited opportunities. Rather than defining success in terms of a newly-conditioned respectable citizen, it must be viewed in terms such as those related to keeping a client out of jail or placing him in a situation superior to any he held previously. In such terms, as the quantitative measures which follow indicate, the Project appeared to achieve considerable success.

---

*The term is from Michael Harrington's The Other America (New York: Macmillan, 1962), pp. 20ff.

Compilation of numerical material was also notably complicated by changing definitional and procedural characteristics of the Job Development work. These include the following, which must be kept in mind in interpreting the tables:

1. A significant number of job placements were made for non-clients, that is, addicts not residing in the target area or individuals not officially processed by other Project personnel. The client files used to assess job placement success, therefore, underestimate the accomplishments of the Job Developers.

2. The official definition of a "client" changed as the Project progressed. In general, as time went on, the tendency was to withhold the official definition until the individual became more firmly affiliated with Project efforts. Partly for this reason, "success" tended to be improved with the passage of time.

3. Some clients applied for employment through the Project but subsequently found jobs on their own, on occasion at least partly in response to advice or admonishments from Project personnel. Records were rarely made of such "successes."

4. Many clients - probably about 25 percent of the total - were placed in more than one job during the period under scrutiny. Figures showing the "number of placements" therefore are higher than those indicating the "number of clients" placed.

5. Many clients contacted the Project merely to placade parole officers who insisted that they make more strenuous efforts to secure work. In some instances, such persons had incomes from illicit sources, such as from narcotics traffic or from the illegal work of prostitute girl-friends, and had neither need nor intention to accept any proferred employment. Such cases, of course, deflate the "success" rate of the Job Developers.

6. The number of Project "failures" was also increased by clients who filed applications with the Job Development Section but failed to appear for subsequent counseling or job placement.

Approximately five applicants were placed in positions or enrolled in training programs each week during the first year of the Project. For the 12-month period which ended July 31, 1968, as Table 1 indicates, a total of 437 applications for jobs were received and 238 persons were placed.

TABLE 1

DISPOSITION OF JOB APPLICANTS

Outcome	Number	Percent
Placed in jobs	141	32
Placed in training programs	97	22
Not placed	199	46
Total	437	100

Restricting the calculations to persons who were officially enrolled as Project clients, raises the rate of successful placements from 54% to 60%, as Table 2 indicates. It is worth noting that of 376 persons considered Project clients during the year period, 263 (70%) applied for job placement. Of the 158 placed in jobs or training programs, 40 (25%) received more than one job placement.

TABLE 2

DISPOSITION OF CLIENT JOB APPLICANTS

Outcome	Number	Percent
Placed in jobs	93	35
Placed in training programs	65	25
Not placed	105	40
Total	263	100

As noted earlier, the files of the Job Development Section were not maintained for the convenience of research efforts to determine the success of the Section. Under such conditions, it became necessary to bring together information from diverse sources to gain an understanding of the status of Project clients at any given moment. On July 31, 1968, the Project had under its aegis some 231 persons, individuals who had been registered at various earlier periods. Almost half of these were employed or in training programs. Thirty-five percent of the clients, however - as Table 3 indicates - were without work, providing an idea of the magnitude of the Job Development Section's task.

TABLE 3

STATUS OF ACTIVE PROJECT CLIENTS ON JULY 31, 1968

Status	Number	Percent
Presently working	69	30
In training program	37	16
Arrested or sought on warrants	32	14
Presently unemployed	81	35
Unknown or not applicable	12	5
Total	231	100

It should be noted that a number of clients whose status is recorded in Table 3 had secured their jobs by means other than those offered through the Project. The rate of 30% employed on July 31st was somewhat higher than that on earlier dates, largely because of the greater care taken before an individual was officially recognized as a Project client.

An attempt to estimate the success of the Project employment efforts was made by obtaining from the field workers their understanding of changes in the employment status of clients, compared to their situation at the time they became clients. It is noteworthy, as Table 4 indicates, that the field workers believed that 42% of the active clients on July 31st had achieved better working conditions since their original association with the Project and that fewer than 10% were in inferior working situation.

TABLE 4

CHANGES IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ACTIVE CLIENTS AS OF JULY 31, 1968

Present Employment Status Compared to Previous Status	Number	Percent
Better	97	42
Worse	21	10
Same	88	38
Don't know or Not Applicable	25	10
Total	231	100

An assessment of the activities of the Job Development Section undertaken by clients, indicated that some 82% of them were "satisfied" with the Section's work, 12% were "dissatisfied," and 6% indicated neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction with the Section. Jobs secured by the Section paid wages from $1.50 to $3.80 an hour with a median of $2.20 an hour. Of persons who left jobs, some 35% reported that they quit voluntarily, with approximately the same number saying that they were terminated by their employer. Eight percent left employment because of arrest or because they had absconded from parole custody while, for the remaining 22%, no official reasons were known regarding the end of their period of employment on the job secured for them through the Project.

It might be noted, in conclusion, that the Job Development Section, functioning as a central part of the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project, appeared to render notable service in obtaining positions for the men who became associated with the Project. That a constant parade of persons seeking work came to the Project, was strong testimony to the services that were offered. Like that of many other helping services, the Job Development performance cannot adequately be measured by a simple inventory of its achievements in its immediate task of job placement. Some of the clients, for instance, might have learned skills and attitudes that will serve them in good stead long after they have left Project roles. Others may have benefitted from the time and interest shown by the Job Developers. Still others, of course, may have been set back by raised hope and unfulfilled expectations. But, taking all things together, the testimony of the clients and the impressions of the researchers combine to indicate that the intense dedication to their clients, shown by the Job Developers, represented one of the strongest points of the Project during its first year of operation.

V. THE DETOXIFICATION PROGRAM

The process of detoxification - withdrawal from opiates - has been the subject for many popular dramatic presentations in the mass media. The image of withdrawal portrayed in motion pictures such as, "The Man with the Golden Arm," all too frequently has led to false ideas in the public mind regarding addiction and the daily lives of drug addicts. The kicking process results from a number of decisions made by the person involved. The addict must decide that he wants to kick a drug habit, he must determine for what reasons he wants to do so, whether to clean up, to avoid detection and possible incarceration, or to cut down on a large and expensive habit. He must then go through the physical distress of withdrawal and combat the intense psychological attraction of return to opiate use. Misunderstanding of these diverse items has contributed to the distorted public imagery and to the considerable folklore that surrounds addiction and withdrawal.

The sensational physical symptomatology popularly associated with withdrawal from opiate derivatives is, at least in terms of conditions in the world of the addict today, a highly overdrawn version of actual circumstances. Physiological symptoms accompanying withdrawal today, most closely approximate a mild to severe case of the flu, marked by nausea, cramps, and difficulty in sleeping.

These symptoms differ greatly from the popular version of an individual thrashing about on the floor, writhing in agony, attempting to slash his wrists by crashing out the window, and similar kinds of dramatic and melodramatic acts.

It is also sometimes believed that once the physiological aspects of withdrawal have disappeared, the addiction problem is solved. We now know, however, that relapse almost always occurs long after physical dependence has been eliminated. Another common misconception about withdrawal is that, to be effective, it must be supervised by medical personnel. The Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project found that medical personnel were not necessary for successful withdrawal in most instances, and that their "cold turkey" approach (abrupt withdrawal without supportive drug regiments) could be carried out without undue difficulty. It is known, in this connection, that addicts will on occasion "use" doctors involved in withdrawal programs to obtain drugs or pills which can only be doled out to them by physicians.

The process of withdrawal, then, begins with a decision on the part of the addict to clean up. Many factors may induce this decision, including family pressures, fear of discovery by parole supervisors, a belief that a drug habit is getting out of hand and too expensive and dangerous, or a desire to alter the behavioral pattern associated with addiction.

The relatively short duration of physical discomfort and its seemingly low intensity appears to be due to the extremely poor grade of heroin which is generally being peddled on the streets today. Estimates indicate that most street-sold heroin is about 3% pure, with diverse innocuous ingredients forming the largest part of the body of the capsule. Correctional nalline testing of persons with narcotics records who are on parole also prevents them from achieving long "runs" on the drug.

Once his physiological symptoms are eliminated, the addict usually takes the view that he is "well" again. Major difficulties are encountered, however, when the now clean ex-addict attempts to integrate himself into the mainstream of the society. As we noted in the previous section, the man often has comparatively little education and few marketable skills, and his record as a onetime narcotics addict, if disclosed to a prospective employer, is apt to cost him a possible job, because the stigma surrounding addicts is even more pervasive than that regarding ex-cons. The kinds of jobs that the former addict is apt to get, involving such menial, uncomfortable and low-paying activities as car-washing - are not apt to enhance either his self-image or his fiscal position. It is also extremely difficult for the former addict to re-establish family ties, if these have been severed by his previous drug use. Many addicts notoriously exploit their families time and again, and ultimately the most trusting relatives become suspicious of alleged reform intentions. Finally, there is always the lure of the drug to resolve for the moment all of these difficulties, and the fact that at least practicing addicts will be accepting of their former companion and co-user. These factors, and others like them, contribute to the notably high relapse rate of narcotic addicts.

The Boyle Heights Detoxification Program -- During the planning phases of the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project, little concern was shown regarding the need for detoxification facilities. The grant proposal merely stated that, "detoxification will be available at the nearby Los Angeles County Hospital when needed," and added rather vaguely, that a program goal would be to "actively promote the use of community detoxification facilities in cases where contacts are made with physically addicted drug users." It was believed at the time, that most persons receiving project services would come directly from penal institutions. Most persons contacted on the streets, it was thought, would be drug-abstinent, but in danger of relapse because of various pressing problems. In instances where a man actively using durgs made contact with the Project, it was expected that he would be referred elsewhere for "drying out" assistance and that, following this, he would be enrolled in Project activities.

The referral procedure fell by the wayside almost at once. Under California law, physicians are required — to report to the authorities any treatment they undertake with narcotic addicts. The presumption is that such reporting will result in the handing over of the patient to the State civil commitment program, a procedure involving approximately nine months of incarceration at the California Rehabilitation Center, and post-institutional surveillance. To virtually all addicts this prospect is extremely distasteful; in fact, less than 3% of the Rehabilitation Center's total population is the product of voluntary commitments, and even among this small group many of the addicts turned themselves in only days or moments before official action would have been taken against them.

It is possible, of course, that physicians might refrain from reporting addicts. For one thing, the law is not altogether specific regarding the categoric nature of the requirement. For another, it could be maintained that the statute is unconstitutional on the ground that it dictates medical practice contrary to the best judgment of members of the profession. Few, if any, physicians are apt to challenge the law enforcement interpretation of the statute, however. Addict clients are frequently intransigient and usually impoverished, and legal entanglements, even if resolved in this favor, would be expensive and time-consuming for a medical practitioner. Resolved against him, they could be devastating to his future career prospects.

The law, section 11391 of the Health and Safety Code, states:

> No person shall treat an addict for addiction except in one of the following: (a) An institution approved by the Board of Medical Examiners, and where the patient is at all times kept under restraint and control; (b) A city or county jail; (c) A state prison; (d) A state narcotics hospital; (e) A state Hospital; (f) A county hospital.

Legislative concern over the possibility that Synanon, a self-help narcotics group with headquarters in Santa Monica, might not be permitted to continue its program of withdrawing persons seeking it out, led to a recent addition to the Health and Safety Code. The proviso reads:

> Neither this section nor any other provision of this division shall be construed to prohibit the maintenance of a place in which persons seeking to recover from narcotics addiction reside and endeavor to aid one another and receive aid from others in recovering from such addiction, nor does this section or such division prohibit such aid, provided that no person is treated for addiction in such place by means of administering, furnishing, or prescribing of narcotics.

As the Boyle Heights Project began to appreciate that a considerable segment of its clientele would consist of persons currently addicted to opiates, attempts were begun to determine how far detoxification efforts might be carried. Legal opinions secured by the Project administrator concurred that some kind of detoxification efforts were possible outside of medical supervision and the necessity for reporting addicts to the state authorities. It was suggested that a maximum of five addicts might be treated in one place at one time without the effort falling within the definition of a medical and hospital facility. Twenty-four hour supervision would be necessary as well; otherwise, Project representatives would be liable for any untoward consequences of the detoxification program.

Early Detoxification Efforts -- The first two addicts in need of detoxification assistance came to the Boyle Heights Project after, according to their reports, having been turned down by Teen Challenge, a religiously-oriented organization with an extensive anti-narcotics program. The field workers who made initial contact with the two men had no guidelines by which to determine their course of action. Attempts to reach quickly Project administrators also proved futile. It was ultimately decided that they would register the men in a nearby hotel, and that voluntary "baby-sitters" would remain with them around-the-clock. The general expectation was that this endeavor would prove worthless. "No one ever kicks when there are two of them," a field worker observed, and the expectation was that the men would leave - "split" - soon after their first withdrawal symptoms became manifest. Despite the pessimistic predictions, however, the men remained in the hotel for several days and dried-up their habits, which had been light. They then left for San Francisco and have not been heard from since. For the field workers, this initial success provided a strong sense of achievement.

This early effort soon led to the informal establishment of a detoxification center - a "kicking pad" the field workers called it - in a home owned by one of the workers. It was a small frame house of four rooms, which was standing vacant at the time. For Project administrators this rather spontaneous development proved something of a dilemma. It had by now become painfully obvious that detoxification work would have to be a main program effort. Nonetheless, no funds had been provided for such work and legal opinions had not yet crystallized regarding the propriety of such work by the Project. In addition, the kicking pad was outside of the geographical area which the Project was expected to serve.

Meanwhile, however, the small house was soon filled to capacity with addicts and an impromptu schedule of field worker supervision was put together, though this proved to be something less than an ideal arrangement.

"Babysitters" would report to work late, skip assignments, or leave the facility for prolonged periods. The men going through withdrawal would, under such conditions, often wander away from the house or leave precipitously without any attempt being made to provide them with support that might better enable them to succeed in withdrawing from the drug.

This first kicking pad operated for approximately nine weeks, from late September through early December. Addicts coming to it were provided with food and cigarettes purchased by means of donations from the Project field workers. Although no accurate records were kept, it is estimated that at least $400 in cash was contributed by the Project staff and another $100 by guests and community members to maintain the facility. During this time, in addition, canned goods, bakery products, meats and cigarettes were contributed by neighborhood merchants.

The reactions of the workers to the incessant demands for donations were ambivalent. They tended to be generous, true to the tradition that disenfranchised persons must look out for one another, or nobody will look out for any of them. They also had a background of sharing with other addicts in times of crisis. On the other hand, they were not without middle-class views regarding philanthropy, some of which they probably always had, others of which were probably a function of their new positions. "We are getting hit about ten times a month for contributions," one worker noted. "This can add up to some real expenses." Another said: "I was making more at my last job when I earned $450 a month. Here we give and give until our salaries don't look so good."

Much of the blame for the necessity of private collections for the detoxification effort was placed upon the Project administrators who had been unable to negotiate an arrangement for detoxification funds. "If I were running this program, the first thing I would have done would have been to get a kicking facility - the very first thing," one field worker noted.

Two of the Project workers canvassed the area for prospective kicking pads to replace the makeshift facility then in use. They finally located a site, but no administrative response was forthcoming within the following two weeks. "I think that we are just getting the usual bureaucratic bullshit. They are dragging their heels and just giving us the run-around on it," one of the men insisted. The administration, besieged from both sides, found itself in the position of not being able to secure funds in large measure because the need had not been anticipated at the time of the original grant request and in some measure because action on the proposal was proceeding painfully slow. The field workers, quite unsympathetic to the delay, took it as a sure sign of lethargy, disinterest, and ineptitude.

No records were kept regarding success of the original kicking pad. It was estimated that some 50 men were housed in it at various times, and it is known that several instances of client drug use and heavy drinking took place in the pad. Probably about half of the persons who began there stayed until they had withdrawn successfully. But the shortcomings of the facility became more evident each day. The matter came to a head when a vote among the field workers decided that the pad should be closed. Supervision problems were getting out of hand; the location was inconvenient; and several Negro clients had complained to field workers that Mexican-Americans in the kicking pad were prejudiced and discriminating against them.

Makeshift procedures continued, however, while attempts were being made to resolve the detoxification impasse with Washington officials. Nearly every field worker had at least one addict in his home for detoxification purposes and a number had as many as four or five persons going through withdrawal. The Teen Challenge facility was frequently resorted to as well. By October 15, the Project had placed 14 persons in Teen Challenge. Only six, however, completed withdrawal, with most of those who left complaining about the strong religious stress at Teen Challenge. Two persons who had been sent to the Salvation Army also left its facilities before being completely withdrawn. A count of the men taken into field worker homes, showed that 11 of 14 finished the withdrawal process, a result which might be a consequence of selective intake or perhaps of the more personal nature of the worker-client relationship.

While funds were being awaited, debate began regarding methods for increasing the success of the detoxification program. A Project administrator suggested that clients might be screened more carefully, indicating that much time and effort was going into cases patently beyond improvement. It was felt that Teen Challenge had become antagonistic to Project referrals, that its assistance had been proferred only to accommodate the Project, and that poorly-screened referrals had just about "burned out" this source of aid. The former addicts, however, took a different view on screening. The Project, they insisted, was supposed to help anyone who asked for help and not select out those who seemed to be able to make best use of help. As one worker put it: "Suppose one of you saw me in County Jail when I was still hustling. You've seen me at my worst. If I had come in and said I wanted to kick, no one would have believed me."

The Official Kicking Pad. -- In January, finally, both the funding and screening problems were resolved. Monies were released from Washington for detoxification and a one-bedroom apartment was secured for the work. Four field workers were given rotating assignments to provide around-the-clock coverage at the facility, which opened its doors on January 16.

The new detoxification facility began under a much more formal program than any effort that had marked previous Project endeavors. In fact, the opening of the facility appeared to coincide with a major re-organization of the Project along more clearly-defined lines. Each person admitted to the kicking pad was carefully interviewed and searched before he was accepted. His parole status was checked, and if he were found to be under parole supervision, his agent was notified and permission was requested for detoxification. Formal rules were established to govern conduct in the pad. There were to be no outside visitors and no telephone calls, in or out. No addict was allowed to leave the pad unless accompanied by a field worker, and there was to be no drinking in the facility.

The addict undergoing withdrawal was under constant scrutiny by a field worker. If any complications developed (a rare occurence) the man would be transported to the nearby County General Hospital for medical assistance. Persons who reported having used opiates for long periods and those who had conditions such as epilepsy, diabetes, or who were pregnant were taken directly to the hospital rather than being admitted to the kicking pad. Persons withdrawing from barbiturate use were also sent to the hospital. The field workers would offer rub down to the men undergoing withdrawal and would try to divert and encourage them with long discussions, when appropriate. The particularly personal nature of the program appeared to be of major importance in bringing about - compared with experiences of Project clients in other settings - so high a rate of success, in terms of completing detoxification for persons in the facility.

From January 16 through July 31, 1968, 182 persons entered the kick pad. Persons on some type of parole status managed to complete withdrawal, as Table 1 shows, to a greater degree than those without official supervision. Motivation and immediate self-interest might account for this result. Persons under supervision realized that if they did not complete withdrawal, they would most likely have their parole status revoked and would be returned to prison.

Table 1

Success of Persons Attempting Withdrawal by Status

January 16 - July 31, 1968

Status	Total Attempts	Number Selected	Percent Successful
Out-Patient: California Rehabilitation Center	11	9	82
Adult Authority Parolee	78	56	71
L. A. County Probationers	8	6	74
Youth Authority Parolee	4	1	25
Federal Parolee	3	1	33
No parole status	78	31	40
TOTAL	182	104	

There were, in addition, 29 persons who underwent multiple attempts to withdraw. Two made four such attempts, one made three, while the remaining 26 tried to withdraw on two separate occasions. In this somewhat limited group, correctional status again was more likely to produce success than absence of such status.

The kicking pad, for those able to take full advantage of its services, served the function of permitting practicing addicts who otherwise would have been returned to institutions to remain in the community and to regain a drug-free condition. The facility itself was a shelter from immediate outside pressures. The police, who had been notified of its location and function, made no attempt to interfere. For the state parole officers, the detoxification program permitted them to keep under supervision within the community, men who otherwise would have had to be returned to correctional institutions. It is arguable, of course, whether continuance of community living was necessarily beneficial for the addict, though most expertise in the field of corrections maintains that it is apt to be. In addition, existence of the detoxification program and the arrangements worked out with parole officials, undoubtedly encouraged many persons under parole supervision, who had absconded rather than face nalline tests and re-institutionalization, to return for detoxification and take up their attempts to remain drug-free.

There were, however, variations in responses to Project work between the state parole authorities and persons making policy for the civil commitment program, operated at the California Rehabilitation Center. As of February, CRC officials had agreed to permit persons under their supervision to detoxify under Project supervision rather than to return them out-of-hand to the institution. In June, however, this policy was rescinded when a CRC parole agent reported that one of his charges had been admitted to the detoxification facility without his prior knowledge, a statement denied by the Project administrators.

It is noteworthy, however, that persons without correctional status were as likely to remain associated with the Boyle Heights Project following detoxification as those under correctional supervision, (See Table 2) despite a smaller numerical pool which had

Table 2

Persons Becoming Clients From Kicking Pad
by Correctional Status

Status	Total	Became Clients No.	%	Clients/7-31-68 No.	%
Out-patient: Calif. Rehabilitation Ctr.	11	5	45	0	0
Adult Authority Parolees	78	35	45	17	22
L.A.County Probationers	8	4	50	3	38
Youth Authority Parolees	4	2	50	1	25
Federal Parolees	3	1	33	0	0
No correctional status	78	39	50	19	24
TOTAL	182	86	47	40	22

successfully completed withdrawal. The conclusions shown in Table 2 would appear to indicate a somewhat stronger motivation toward project offers, on the part of persons coming to detoxification without correctional considerations exerting suasion upon them. In addition, of course, correctional clients had an opportunity to receive assistance from their agents following their experience with the Project, while non-correctional individuals might have more often found themselves without other community resources to assist them.

In conclusion, the multiple approaches to detoxification utilized by the Project proved to be quite ineffectual in terms of attracting and retaining clients, despite its obvious appeal to large numbers of addicts on the street. The ultimate decision to formalize kicking procedures was, in retrospect, a wise move on the part of the administrators, who had learned from the early abortive efforts, that more control should be exercised. The pad attracted many sick addicts and proved successful in detoxifying a majority of them, although relatively few ever became clients. In the future, further effort should be expended toward recruitment of clients undergoing detoxification. This might be accomplished by more stringent selection procedures, improving the quality of the personnel running the pad, and/or more contacts by project caseworkers with those detoxifying, rather than waiting until they are released from the pad.

VI. THE PROJECT'S CLIENTS

In this section we will describe some characteristics of Project clients and provide some indication of the success the Project had with persons who came into contact with it.

The lack of a consistent and precise definition of the conditions necessary for characterization as a "client" of the Project was a continuous source of research difficulty. Project staff members showed much less concern with clear determination of the criteria necessary for classification as a "client" than the research workers, who were critically concerned with standardized procedures that could be employed to arrive at some sophisticated interpretation of the results that the Project was achieving.

Most of the Project services were open to anyone who expressed a need for them, and it seemed to the staff workers that the question of whether a person getting help was called a client or not bore little relationship to the fundamental aims and achievements of the work being done. In addition, the bureaucratic procedures which would have to be established in order to make precise determinations of subjects' status - procedures such as processing and interviewing - were seen as impeding necessary flexibility and hampering a state of unencumbered informality that would best serve staff-client rapport. In addition, an insistence on a consistent involvement in Project activities - merely for the purpose of achieving a formal status on its roles -

seemed an unreasonable requirement if it bore little or no relationship to the needs of the client himself.

In part, of course, the foregoing constituted rationalizations for a certain disinclination on the part of the staff workers to take on additional categorization tasks which merely served the purposes of the evaluative effort. In part, however, they truly reflected the discrepant demands of research and helping efforts; the former less interested in random procedures, more interested in rigor and routine - the latter more concerned with responsiveness, sometimes of an idiosyncratic nature, to individual cases, less concerned with the niceties of titles and categories and similar classificatory mechanisms.

For these reasons, among others, criteria for the identification of clients were essentially non-existent during the initial months of the Boyle Heights program. Fieldworkers clogged files with the names of friends and random contacts, some of whom had never participated in any aspect of the program. Workers suspected that their job depended upon their success in locating clients, and they knew that it would be expremely difficult to differentiate between spurious and intense contacts during this early stage of work.

Before long, however, the administrators of the Project tightened procedures and began a process of regular review of the files. From this process there emerged by the end of the first year of operation, four categories of Project clients. These were:

1. Probationary: Persons having been processed and participating in the program for less than thirty days.
2. Active: Persons who had maintained a client status for more than thirty days and who were maintaining steady contact with Project caseworkers.
3. Suspended: Persons temporarily dropped from active status with the Project because of marginal contact with its workers or because of short jail sentences which interrupted their contact.
4. Closed: Persons considered to have no further interest in the Project or persons who had received lengthy prison sentences or had moved away from the geographic area.

An examination of the categories indicates that in many respects judgments regarding the inclusion of a given individual in one or another classification is rather arbitrary, involving judgments regarding in some instances subjective interpretations of a subject's actions and attitudes. For this reason, statements based upon the roster of persons in any given category need to be regarded with some caution. It is important to appreciate, also, that "success" rates are directly influenced by the rigor with which classification judgments are made. In this manner, the "success" rate may be inflated by restricting admission to the "active" category to only those persons managing consistently to meet Project requirements and then measuring "success" only in terms of the outcome of such individuals. In this manner, with such self-fulfilling research approaches, some projects have been able to show striking results, results which in many instances actually indicate only that the Project helped persons who probably would have succeeded anyway.

The policy of the Boyle Heights Project in practice tended toward keeping persons on the active roles who by most standards would probably not have been regarded as meriting this status. During case reviews involving caseworkers and the field coordinators, the caseworkers tended to plead the case for marginal clients being retained on the active roles, and their views usually prevailed. (These pleas reflected the caseworkers' consistent empathy based upon their own past marginality.) Removal from the active roles then would take place only when there was a blatant lack of involvement with the Project's work by the onetime client. An examination of those cases discontinued (in both the "closed" and "suspended" categories) showed that 89 percent of the individuals had only gone through detoxification and/or the initial orientation provided by the Project. The active client files may therefore be regarded as including a considerable number of persons with only a marginal relationship to the Project. It would be difficult to determine, knowing no more about such persons, whether they would be apt to contribute to an image of "success" or one of "failure".

It may be presumed that some of them failed to take more intensive advantage of Project resources because they were doing well and not in need of further assistance, while others were unresponsive to Project offers because of a general disinterest in its aims or an inability to function in terms of Project demands for certain levels of conformity.

ON MEASURING SUCCESS

There is a tendency among persons unfamiliar with the life styles of hard-core narcotic addicts to expect "success" from a project such as that operated in Boyle Heights in terms of total conversion of a client to middle-class patterns of life. There is a particular assumption that success will mean total repudiation of drug use.

More realistic goals might, however, involve less dramatic and fundamental alterations in the life of Project clients. Again, the criteria of success will have a penetrating influence on the results obtained. If a slum job training project was expected to produce millionaires, it would likely come to be regarded as a total failure; if it was expected to improve upon the previous working patterns of its clientele and to raise their income somewhat, it might come to be regarded as a successful endeavor. So too with the Boyle Heights Project. It appears reasonable to view as a successful effort any intervention which interrupts the recurring cycle of addiction and incarceration and which lengthens the periods of abstinence from drugs and the amount of time spent outside of correctional auspices.

As former addicts themselves, the Project caseworkers appeared to be especially sensitive about the importance of subtle and seemingly minor changes which mark an addict's apparent gradual evolution toward a drug-free life. Queries regarding individual clients were apt to bring forth from the caseworkers replies such as the following:

> "He's chipping around a bit, but he's holding down a job for a change."
>
> "He is still using, but he's grouping (attending group sessions) every week."
>
> "She's back with her husband, and seems a lot happier. She still drops pills every now and then."
>
> "He hasn't used for four months, but he is living with this girl who's a long-time hype."

The number of variables referred to in these comments suggests the difficulties involved in unraveling the complexities of an addict's life in order to make an accurate appraisal of his progress. For the caseworkers, the ingredients of their evaluations bespoke a common understanding of signs of danger and omens of hope. Living with a girl who was using drugs, for instance, was seen as an obvious portend of return to drugs by the subject; attending groups was regarded as a hopeful indication, perhaps as much because it indicated an interest in change as for what the client might learn from the experience.

There is, of course, always a tendency to isolate individual cases in which intervention tactics have seemingly produced striking results. Among other things, such a process serves to fortify feelings of Project utility and to provide inspiration for similar kinds of achievements. Individual cases, however, tell little about the overall utility of the Project and there is always the risk that the success they portray would have occurred without the intervention of the caseworker. On the other hand, case histories do provide at times more meaningful measures of impact that statistical analysis which may hide behind average figures quite spectacular successes and equally dramatic instances of failure.

The following three cases, slightly abridged, were chronicled by caseworkers to highlight instances in which they believed their work had been particularly fruitful. They should not, of course, be regarded as "typical" Project cases:

> Case #1. Client, a 17-year-old within one month of graduation from high school, was arrested and detained for possession of barbiturates. Arresting officers refused to release client to parents, recommending that he be held in juvenile hall until his hearing. Client's caseworker attended predetention hearing, explained the Project's program and pointed out that detention would prevent client from graduating. Client was released in his parent's custody on the condition that he involve himself in the Project. Caseworker worked closely with client for the next two months, during which client graduated from high school and

remained drug-free. He obtained a job, and later was upgraded through the Job Development Section. The caseworker provided a detailed progress report on the client for the Juvenile Court, and the client was granted probation.

Case #2. Client, a 26-year-old female parolee began seeing her ex-husband, a practicing addict, keeping the association secret from her caseworker and her parole agent. Client encouraged her ex-husband to involve himself with the Project, but without success. Client began using drugs with her husband, and informed her caseworker about it only when instructed by her parole agent to report for narcotics testing. The Project Director contacted client's parole agent, explained the situation, and received permission to attempt to detoxify client. The caseworker took client into her own home to detoxify. In a subsequent staff meeting, it was discovered that two other caseworkers knew client's ex-husband personally, and they in turn persuaded him to detoxify and become a client. Both have now abstained from drugs and attend the Project's Family Counseling Groups.

Case #3. Client, a 41-year-old who had been involved with the Project, abstaining from drug use and employed full-time for nine months, was arrested for stealing an auto battery while under the influence of alcohol. He had borrowed a friend's car, broken its battery, and resorted to an attempted theft in order to replace it. From the police station, client telephoned his caseworker, who went immediately to the jail and posted bail. Had the client stayed overnight in jail, an automatic parole "hold" would have been placed on him, making it impossible to bail out and return to work. The caseworker subsequently explained the situation to the parole agent and the judge. The charge of petty theft was reduced, and client was given a suspended sentence. Client had been an addict for twenty-five years, never having remained drug-free nor employed for more than four months. He remains abstinent and employed.

NUMERICAL PORTRAIT OF CLIENTS

The number of clients listed in the Project files grew steadily during the early months of work. Following more formal definitions of active and non-active clients, the list was pared somewhat. In addition, after the initial gathering in of the most obvious prospects, recruitment of new persons for the Project roles decelerated somewhat. By March, two hundred individuals were on active status, and at the end of the first year of Project work - July 31, 1968 - there were 231 persons listed as active clients. It was this cohort which was used to provide a numerical portrait of some attributes of the persons with whom the Project came in contact.

As Table 1 indicates, a considerable portion of the clientele fell between the ages of 30 to 39, reflecting an intake concentrating to a large extent on older persons with more established drug habits. Most of the clients (199 or 86 per cent) were males and most (also 199 or 86 per cent) were Mexican-Americans, reflecting the ethnic character of the geographical location of the Project. On the other hand, the underrepresentation of both Negroes and Caucasians, even granting their smaller proportions in Boyle Heights, may reflect either an ethnic disproportion in the addiction situation or in the intake procedures. Only 14 clients (6 percent) were black and 11 (5 percent) Caucasian, despite the presence of....white caseworkers on the Project staff and....black workers.

Table 1

Age Composition of Project Clientele

Age Bracket (years)	Number	Percent
Under 20	42	18%
20 - 29	69	30
30 - 39	87	38
40 - 49	28	12
50 and Over	5	2
Total	231	100%

A large percentage of the clients, as Table 2 indicates, were single. Considering the average age of the persons represented on Project roles, the small percentage (26 percent) of married persons might indicate that a life of addiction is incompatible with a stable marital commitment. Most caseworkers put forward such an interpretation of the statistics, though it is equally plausible to suspect that the same items which led to avoidance of marriage may have been responsible for the addiction itself.

Table 2

Marital Status of Project Client

Marital Status	Number	Percent
Single	106	46%
Married	60	26
Divorced	35	15
Separated	16	7
Common-law relationship	14	6
Total	231	100%

Just about two-thirds of the persons coming to the Project and being placed on active status carried some correctional status, as Table 3 shows, with a majority being on parole from the California Adult Authority. It might be inferred that the Project provided some services beyond those offered by the regular parole and outpatient offices, and it will be interesting to determine in the future whether clients with a combination of official and Project assistance performed better than those with only Project help. It will be necessary, however, to make certain that original difference between the two groups were not themselves responsible for any outcome variations. In any event, it is noteworthy that one-third of the Project clients were without official correctional status, indicating the importance of providing services for a group which has no official entree to governmental assistance for their problems with drugs. That such persons are reluctant to contact official agencies is understandable, given the fact that they are very likely to be placed in confinement if it is established that they are using drugs.

Table 4

Correctional Status of Project Clients

Correctional Status	Number	Percent
California Adult Authority	83	36%
No correctional status	79	34
California Youth Authority	26	12
Los Angeles County Probation	20	9
California Rehabilitation Center	14	6
Federal Probation or Parole	9	4
Total	231	100%

The Project statistics also indicate that, for the large majority of the Project clients, opiates constituted the major drug problem. One hundred and ninety-four (84 percent) were mainly involved with opiates, compared to only 28 (12 percent) who identified their primary drug problem as barbiturates and amphetimines, and four (2 percent) who were primarily involved with marijuana.

Each active client was also requested during intake to indicate what he felt his primary problem was. It is noteworthy that the largest number of responses (Table 5) indicated difficulties in the realm of employment. For outsiders, it might be presumed that drug use constituted the most fundamental client problem. Perhaps they too saw it this way, and merely viewed their addiction as a long-term "given", with employment standing as the most immediate and reparable difficulty facing them. Perhaps, too, it was

Table 5

Clients' Perceptions of Their Primary Problem

Problem Mentioned	Number	Percent
Employment	122	53%
Drug Use	58	25
Other Problems (Lack of residence, clothing, poor social life, etc.)	21	9
No Response	18	8
Family Problems	12	5
Total	231	100%

the Project's known ability to find jobs for clients that brought a selective group of individuals to its doors.

Total Clientele. In addition to the 231 persons listed on the active roles of the Project as of July 31, 1968, there were 145 names in the discontinued file. Eighty-three of these cases had been suspended and 62 closed. Table 6 presents the reasons given for removing the 145 cases from the active files. It will be of future interest to determine the ultimate outcome of individuals in these categories compared to persons who remained active with the Project.

Table 6

Reasons for Suspended or Closed Cases

Reason	Number	Percent
Left or Found to be Outside of Target Area	47	33%
Lack of Interest in Project	44	30
Incarcerated	42	29
Parolee at Large (Abscended)	10	7
Deceased	2	1
Total	145	100%

The number of clients officially tabulated in the active file (231 persons) and the suspended or closed file (145 persons) fails to indicate very clearly the total volume of business that passed through the Project. Many persons utilized project services, such as job placement, detoxification, group therapy sessions, or were involved in contacts between the Project and the correctional authorities without ever officially being recorded as clients. Excluding those persons who were involved with the Project as members of audiences before which caseworkers appeared, it is estimated that approximately 2,000 persons were given some service during the first year of operation of the Narcotics Prevention Project.

CASEWORKER EVALUATIONS OF SUCCESS

In order to acquire at least some idea of the possible success which the Project was achieving, the caseworkers were requested to evaluate the relative progress, if any, of their clients in the areas of their correctional status, their drug use, and the in "general" situation. The inquiry covered a 70 percent random sample of active clients who were more than 18 years old and who had been active for at least thirty days. The validity of the caseworker judgments are, of course, open to serious questions, and certainly they do not reflect any hard measure based upon operational definitions of improvement. On the other hand, given the nature of the work and the subtle character of changes in clients - combined with a certain real cynicism found in the caseworkers who had gone this route themselves - the evaluations offer some insight into what may have been happening with clients as a result of Project efforts.

As Table 7 indicates, the caseworkers were inclined to

Table 7

CHANGES IN CORRECTIONAL STATUS, DRUG SITUATION, AND GENERAL ADJUSTMENT OF CLIENT AS MEASURED BY CASEWORKER

Change	Category Correctional Status	Drug Situation	General Condition
Better	1%	41%	49%
Worse	21	6	13
Same	75	46	38
No Evaluation	3	7	

view about 51 percent of these cases with which they dealt as successes. Presumably, this success was in large measure related to changes in the drug situation of the client, since 41 percent of the clients were seen as being in a better situation in regard to drugs. On the other hand, the perceived success rate of 49 percent, indicates as well that items other than the client's drug situation were considered in determining his general progress.

VII. THE FIELD WORKERS

The men and women selected for the project field staff were, as indicated earlier, the product of a process involving friendship networks, shared correctional experiences, residential propinquity, and similar items. As part of the research effort, each field worker employed on the Project was interviewed for some two or three hours shortly after he began work. The extremely short period of employment for several men - as little as a day or two for some - precluded their inclusion in the interviewing program, as they had left the Project before we could arrange appointments with them.

By the end of the first year of the Project, 36 persons had been interviewed and supplied answers to a 27-page questionnaire, adapted almost intact from work conducted by Richard Brotman and his associates at the New York Hospital (see Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire). In this section, we will provide a group portrait of these 36 persons along dimensions that appear to be related to their possible performance on the job. Following this, we will differentiate in terms of questionnaire responses among four categories of field workers, after 18 months of the Project's existence. These categories are: 1) Persons still employed by the Project; 2) Persons who had returned to any form of drug use, excluding marijuana use; 3) Persons who had on their own accord, left the Project; and 4) Persons who had been fired from the Project, but had no known drug use in the time period under examination. Drug use was defined in rather strict terms, so that a number of instances where there were strong suspicions of such use we did not classify the person as a user, preferring instead to do so only where there were admissions of use or where the evidence was overwhelming.

Field Workers as a Group -- The 36 persons employed during the first year of the Project showed an average age of 36.3 years, with the majority of the workers between 25 and 39 years old. The age range was from 20 years to 65 years. For the 20-year old, a female, the Boyle Heights Project was her first job. The mother of two children, she had spent most of her adult life subsisting on welfare allowances, and had been a sporadic user of heroin. The 65-year old, a male, had a long drug history, dating back to shortly after the passage of the Harrison Act in 1914. He had been hired as a field worker on the Project after first being a client in its detoxification facility where he was kicking a mild heroin habit. He drank heavily (which ultimately led to his being fired), had virtually no social contacts in the community, and was well-liked by the other field workers partly because of his mild, rather passive behavior, partly because he was more than willing to assume extra duties.

Thirty of the workers (83 per cent) were males and six (17 per cent) females. It will later be indicated that differentiation by sex was the most meaningful item in predicting whether or not the worker would remain on the Project, and whether or not he would return to drug use. The male employees tended to be older than the female workers, with the six women divided rather evenly among the various age brackets: two were in their early 20's, three in their 30's, and one was 43-years old.

The ethnicity of the Project staff did not reflect the ethnic character of the Boyle Heights area very directly. No particular effort had been made to match precisely, workers with potential clients on this dimension, though hiring preference did lean toward Mexican-Americans. The Boyle Heights area, as we have noted elsewhere, is 76 per cent Mexican-American. Nineteen (53 per cent) of the field workers were Mexican-Americans, six (16 per cent) were blacks, and 11 (31 per cent) were whites. The Negro ratio was particularly disproportionate to the ethnic composition of the area, since less than two per cent of the population in Boyle Heights is Negro. Ultimately, perhaps in part because of this disproportionality, Negro and white field workers tended to leave the Project to a greater extent than Mexican-Americans.

Given their ethnic backgrounds, it is hardly unexpected that the vast majority of the field workers listed Roman Catholicism as their religious affiliation. Sixty-four per cent said that they had been Roman Catholics, twenty-two per cent Protestants, three per cent (one person) Jewish, and eleven per cent declared that they had had no religious involvement. More interesting were the discrepant rates with which the field workers had fallen away from their religious affiliations. Currently, only twenty per cent indicated continued membership in the Roman Catholic church. Fourteen per cent retained their original Protestant affiliations, while sixty-four per cent of the respondents reported that they presently had no religious convictions.

The disproportionate falling away from their church of the Roman Catholics is very likely considerably higher than the rate which prevails in the larger community among persons of the same faith. It may, perhaps, say something about the ability of the Roman Catholic church to tolerate narcotic addicts, or, conversely, about the ability of the addicts to tolerate Roman Catholicism.

A very high percentage of the persons who listed themselves as members of Protestant denominations were intensely involved in religious work, usually of a kind that would be labelled fundamentalist. The researchers felt that these men as a group tended to moralize to their clients - that is, they tended to define addiction as a sin - and because of this in part, they were apt to be regarded less favorably by the Project administrators, who would often assign them to desk jobs. There was agreement, however, that their perfervid religious convictions were likely to be of substantial importance in helping them cease drug use and in aiding them in forming new styles of life. Few of these men remained with the Project at the end of 18 months, but only one of them had returned to drug use; most often, they had formed affiliations with self-help groups which gave them more leeway to express their religious convictions.

The field workers were evenly divided among the various designated marital statuses. At the time of the first interviews, 13 of the workers were married, nine were divorced, 11 single, two were separated, and one was widowed. These numerical indications of family status, however, hardly reflect the diversity and dynamics of heterosexual arrangements that then to mark addict life and which were characteristic of the experience of the field workers on the Boyle Heights Project. During the first year of the Project, there were numerous changes in marital status. In addition, very few of the single or divorced workers were without roommates of the opposite sex for very long periods of time; these liaisons ranged from tne very intense and dedicated to the very casual. For the most part, the relationships appeared to be quite stable, common-law-type marriages that kept the Project worker domesticated, though the Project males tended toward denial of the permanence of the relationship and of the possibility that it might ever be formalized. On the other hand, as in most types of employment, domestic squabbles and brawls were regularly reflected in the workers' job performances.

Slightly less than half of the workers had completed high school, with a range of educational experience extending from one man who had "some grade school" through one who had completed college. Interestingly, our attempt to compare the education of the field workers with that of their father's came to naught because almost half (46%) of the employees had no idea how far their fathers had proceeded in school.

In addition to the more formal kinds of indications of demographic conditions, the workers were asked to provide self-ratings on various aspects of their past and present life and rather detailed reports on their drug use histories.

They were asked, for instance, to describe their present situation in regard to eight items as "excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor." As newly-hired employees, with salaries higher than they might reasonably have anticipated in the regular job market, they could have been expected to have pictured their condition in rather amiable terms. That almost all of their ratings were in the "excellent" and "good" columns is, therefore, not surprising. There are, however, a number of meaningful distinctions drawn by the workers among the eight items. Two of them, for instance, were reported as much less adequate than the remaining six - "the place where you live, as a home for you" and "your ability to get service from agencies and professionals." The other six were: "in general, your ability to get along in life"; "your enjoyment of your space time"; "your relations with friends and acquaintances"; "your relations with family members"; "your work life (on the job, in the home, or at school)" and "your health in general."

The item regarding the adequacy of the place where they lived drew 56% of the responses in the "excellent" or "good" category, while the employees indicated in 65% of their responses that their ability to get services from agencies and professionals was "excellent" or "good". These responses contrast sharply to the 91% who reported both their health and their relationships with friends and acquaintances as "excellent" or "good". The answers appear particularly noteworthy in terms of the Project's later concentration for the field workers on mediation between them and the so-called Establishment bureaucracy, an area in which it was felt that particular success was realized.

Very likely also as a reflection of their employment on the Project, 18 of the ex-addicts rated their "hope for the future" as "excellent." In comparison, only seven provided "excellent" answers to evaluations of their "happiness" and only nine in regard to their "mental health." It would seem reasonable to conclude from these responses that the ex-addicts entered into their jobs on the Project with high, probably exaggerated hopes for what their positions would now mean to their future life. In addition, it would seem likely that the frame of reference in terms of which they judged their future prospects was tied closely to ingredients of their past, and that their aspirations for the future related in particular to their ability to remain free of drug use and to stay out of correctional facilities. Nonetheless, the comparatively low rating of "happiness" and of "mental health" - compared to the 14 persons who rated their "physical health" as excellent - would appear to indicate possible future pitfalls for the workers, who still saw themselves as far from an optimum point in their aspirations for themselves.

Very few of the employees reported contact with welfare agencies, a finding not anticipated though, as we had expected, virtually all of them had prior contact with lawyers, probation and parole officers, clergymen, employment agencies, and medical clinics. Twenty-five of the 36 employees had never seen a doctor for psychiatric help and approximately the same number had never been to a psychiatric clinic. In the same manner, nearly 2/3 of the employees had never had contact with a social work agency or with the Department of Public Social Service, the county welfare organization. Popular ideas that addicts, because of their recourse to narcotics, spend large amounts of time as welfare recipients, fail to receive confirmation from the records of the Project employees.

There was a wide variation among the employees in terms of the kinds of drugs with which they had had experience. Most generally, they had concentrated upon use of opiates rather than barbiturates and psychedelics. Age tended to be an important variable in determining the drug use pattern of the employee. Older persons were apt to have had experience primarily with opiates, while younger employees were more apt to have experimented with many different kinds of drugs, especially new ones such as methedrine and LSD. All but two of the workers had used at least one opiate and some had used as many as ten drugs in the opiate class, drugs such as morphine and codeine, and synthetics such as demerol and methadone. Only four had never used barbiturates, while four of the workers had used five different kinds of barbiturates. Three had never used amphetamines, and three had used as many as five of these drugs. All had used psychedelics, with a majority (22) having used only marijuana in the psychedelic group, which included LSD, peyote and DMT.

Table 1 indicates the 14 drugs which most respondents reported having used.

Table 1

Reported Incidence of Various Drug Usages

	Drug	Number Reporting Use	Percent
1.	Marijuana	36	97
2.	Heroin	33	89
3.	Benzedrine	33	89
4.	Nembutal	31	84
5.	Morphine	29	78
6.	Speedballs(heroin & cocaine)	27	73
7.	Codeine	27	73
8.	Phenobarbital	27	73
9.	Dexedrine	26	70
10.	Cocaine	25	68
11.	Opium	25	68
12.	Dilaudid	23	62
13.	Demerol	23	62
14.	Methadone	21	57

In addition, 24 of the ex-addicts had used substances such as cough syrup, hair products, or vanilla extract for purposes other than medicinal or those for which they were intended by their manufacturers. On the other hand, a majority - 21 - had never sniffed things such as glue or gasoline. Of those who had used such items, most had done it only once or twice, and then usually while they were in correctional institutions. It is noteworthy that those addicts assigned to assist teachers in junior high school classrooms, as the report on that segment of the Project points out clearly, were particularly vehement in speaking to pupils regarding their feelings about the "stupidity" (a word they often used in this connection) of glue-sniffing.

It was interesting that only 21 of the employees thought that drugs had played "the most important part" in their lives. Either the view of the majority society, stipulating that the most fundamental characteristic of these men and women that differentiates them from others was their drug use, is incorrect, or a large number of the ex-addicts misperceived or misrepresented the dominant item fashioning the distinctive pattern of their existence, i.e., long periods of incarceration for drug use.

The imperative nature of drug use was the explanation most often offered by the former addicts as "possible reasons for drug use." The listing of such reasons is given in Table 2 in descending order of importance:

Table 2

Explanations Offered for Drug Use Indicated In Descending Order

	Explanation	Number of Persons Indicating Item as Explanation	Percent
1.	Because it's an everyday necessity	33	89
2.	Because of building up a craving	32	87
3.	To feel pleasant or high	29	78
4.	Because of feeling down or disappointed	28	75
5.	To loosen up in a social situation	26	70
6.	To go along with the group	24	65
7.	Because of outside pressures	24	65
8.	Because of tension and nervousness	23	62
9.	Because of painful feelings and thoughts	21	57
10.	To help to get to sleep	21	57
11.	Because of physical pain or illness	14	38
12.	To get along with a particular person		
13.	To help to go without eating	7	18

The estimated cost of past drug use varied from five former addicts who said that their drug use had "usually" cost them less than $100. a week, to seven who claimed that their habit usually cost them more than $500. each week. The remainder fell between the two extremes, with the majority saying that drugs usually cost them somewhere between $200 and $300 a week. To get this money, most of the former addicts who indicated lesser amounts of expenditure for drugs said that they got funds from working or from their families, though many also noted that they had stolen money and peddled drugs. Those claiming more costly habits almost always stole the money or sold drugs to obtain it, though one respondent said that he was able to support a large habit through his salary from a legal job and from an insurance settlement.

All of the employees claimed to know well over 100 addicts, an obvious consequence of their correctional experience as well as their sub-culture involvement in the addict community.

VIII. EIGHTEEN MONTH EXPERIENCE FOR FIELD WORKERS

Comparisons among field workers still employed in the Project, those who had returned to drug use, and those who had been terminated or had resigned from the Project indicated a number of significant differentiating items.

First, Table 3 indicates the number of individuals falling into each of the relevant categories:

Table 3

Employee Status as of January 1, 1969

Status	Number	Percent
Still Active	12	33
Use of Drugs	10	28
Terminated	5	14
Resigned	9	25
TOTAL	36	100

The rate of return to drug use cannot readily be compared to that found in other studies of addicts. For one thing, use of any drug, such as amphetamines or barbiturates, was taken as "drug use" for our purposes, while most studies count only that kind of use which eventuates in revocation of parole status. Generally, under such conditions, use other than that of opiates probably goes undetected much more readily than was true for the Project workers. On the other hand, it seems likely that at least a small percentage of the workers who were terminated or resigned also were involved with drugs, a situation which would increase the use category. Taking all things together, it would seem fair to enter the general observation that the results of the Project in terms of its ability to make a sizeable impact on the use patterns of the workers, were not encouraging. It must be remembered that the workers had been drug-free for sizeable periods of time prior to their employment - a minimum of six months was a fundamental requirement - and that on this basis alone, their prognosis should have been encouraging.

Male-Female Differences -- The major comparison will be drawn between the workers still active on the Project, 18 months after its inauguration (12 persons) and those who had returned to drug use (10 persons). The active workers can reasonably be regarded as drug-abstinent because of the regular urinalysis tests to which they are subjected.

The most distinguishing item between the two groups was their sexual composition. As of January 1, 1969, 12 men and no women remained among the employees hired During the first year of the Project. During that time, 30 men and six women had been employed. Of the ten persons who had reverted to drug use, four were women, a heavy disproportion. Two other women had resigned from the Project, and one of these was strongly suspected of having used drugs following her resignation. The sixth woman resigned because of pregnancy, and she represents, therefore, the only female associated with the Project who did not return to drug use. On the other hand, six out of the 29 men returned to drug use - a rate of 84% failure for the women compared to slightly more than 20% for the men.

The failure rate of the women seems to be directly traceable to their experiences while serving as field workers. In theory, they had been hired to supervise female clients, but there was some sexual mingling of the caseloads - and it was this element which appeared to be most significant in leading the women employees back into drug use.

Further particulars on the dynamics of this situation can be gathered from a brief examination of several specific instances. One female employee, 37 years old, was married to a man who later became a Project client. Twice during her tenure on the Project, he was returned to correctional institutions. When he was released the last time, she had been on the Project for 18 months, but she began using with him, and ultimately stole checks and office equipment from the Project. Until that time, she had been regarded as one of the best field workers and her tenure on the Project had been the longest period that she had remained drug-abstinent.

The oldest female employee, 43 years old, had worked as an orientation specialist, largely because of her self-expressed fear of contact with and contamination from clients. She corresponded with one of the Project clients who had been institutionalized. Upon his release, she began to live with him. The relationship became unsettled very quickly and, according to the woman's report, she began using drugs with him in order to stabilize it. Shortly thereafter, she quit the Project. At the time, no one had been aware of her use. She quickly took up with self-help groups and reportedly has subsequently been able to stay away from drugs.

The youngest worker, a 20-year old girl, who had only a sporadic use history in the past, began dating a Project client and quit her job just a few days before she was scheduled to be terminated. She returned to drug use with her boyfriend, who was subsequently arrested for his fourth armed robbery and given an indeterminate sentence with a life-term maximum. She was later returned to the State civil commitment facility.

The first female to be fired from the project was in her 30's. She was accused of misappropriation of funds from a federal project on which she had previously been employed. The charges were dropped because of lack of evidence; however, by this time she had violated conditions of her parole, and when she turned herself in voluntarily, she was found to be addicted. At the time, she was living with a former narcotics dealer.

The last female to be terminated was dropped from the Project when her work deteriorated noticeably toward the end of her first year of employment. Reports indicate that she has become associated with a former Project client and that she is currently using drugs. It was this association which apparently led to the decline in her work performance and the resumption of drug abuse.

Finally, it needs noting that in the single case of a female employee in which no confirmed drug use had taken place, there was also close association with a client - in fact, probably the closest association resulting from the Project. In this instance, the worker married a Project client who was known to be a heavy user of barbiturates. Pregnant at the time, the girl very shortly left her husband, ostensibly be ause of his drug situation.

Substance Attitudes -- Of the large number of other variables examined in an attempt to differentiate successful from unsuccessful workers (measured by their ability to stay with the Project and to remain drug free), two items requesting attitudes toward drugs showed the most distinction among the various groups.

The first item was: "There are many days when I don't think about it (drugs) at all."

As Table 4 shows, eight out of 12 (75% of the persons still active on the Project agreed with this statement, while only three out of 10 of those who had returned to drug use agreed with it. The group who had quit and those who had been terminated tended to duplicate the responses of persons still actively at work.

Table 4

Responses to Question Concerning Thinking About Drugs

"There are Many Days When I Don't Think About it at All."	Users No.	Users %	Active No.	Active %	Quit No.	Quit %	Terminated No.	Terminated %
Agree	3	30	8	75	6	67	3	60
Disagree	7	70	4	25	3	33	2	40
Totals	10	100	12	100	9	100	5	100

The second item was: "I would like to get it (drugs) out of my life, once and for all."

Not surprisingly, those persons still active with the Project showed considerably higher agreement with this statement than those who had reverted to drug use - 75% against 40%. In this instance, the "quit" cases were in line with the users, while persons terminated from the Project - in each of the five cases - agreed with the statement. Though there are too few cases to allow confident interpretations, it would seem that those terminated and those active shared at least one characteristic in relationship with the Project, their intent to remain with it voluntarily, and, perhaps, to use it as a vehicle for a drug-free existence.

Table 5

Responses to Question Concerning Attitude Toward Drugs

"I Would Like to Get It Out of My Life, Once and for All."	Users		Active		Quit		Terminated	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agree	4	40	8	75	3	33	5	100
Disagree	6	60	4	25	6	66	0	0
Totals	10	100	12	100	9	99	5	100

Other Measures -- In age, the active group was 37.0 and the users 36.4. The persons terminated were considerably older - 44.0 - indicating perhaps, that the demands of the field work job were too strenuous for the oldest cadre.

Racial breakdowns showed the Caucasians highly over-represented in the group quitting the Project (55%) compared to their proportion among those remaining active (17%) and those returning to use (20%). The assumption here was that the racial composition of the Project staff and the setting of hhe Project were primarily responsible for the higher turnover rate of Caucasians. Perhaps, also, there were more attractive opportunities available to the whites than to blacks or Mexican-Americans. Negroes were more apt to return to use (30%) than to remain with the Project (8%). Eighteen per cent of those who quit were Negroes, though no Negroes were terminated.

Marital status also showed a not inconsiderable correlation with outcome. Married persons, as might be expected, showed a significantly higher rate of continuing activity as workers, with exactly half of the 12 persons still on the payroll being married. No married man had been terminated, four (36%) had quit, but only three (30%) had gone back to drugs. Only one divorced man (8%) remained active, while three (30%) returned to drugs, three (33%) quit the Project, and three others (60%) were terminated.

In education, the possibility that lack of alternatives might have led to stronger adherence to the Project job, receives some confirmation from the figures indicating that none of the persons who returned to use had only a grade school education, while four of those still active on the Project had gone no further than eighth grade. Curiously, two of the five persons terminated (40%) had attended colleges, while only 10% of the users, 8% of the still-active workers, and 18% of those who had quit, had done so.

For some reason, the active workers showed a much greater number of times in regular hospitals than those who had returned to use - 3.5 to 1.9 - somewhat surprising considering that the ages of the two groups were almost identical. Neither group had been in mental hospitals very much - .1 for the users and .2 for the active group.

The patterns of drug use between the diverse groups were almost equivalent. The users reported having tried 5.7 opiates, exactly the average of the worker group, and just below that of those who had quit (6.0). The active group had used more barbiturates (4.3) than those who returned to drug use (3.6) though less than those who had quit (5.4) In regard to amphetamines, the active group had tried 2.9 different ones, compared to 3.3 for the users and 4.0 for those who had quit work on the Project. Psychedelic use rates (a category including marijuana) were close: 2.3 for the users, 2.2 for the workers, and 2.8 for those who had quit. Taken together, the nine men who had quit the Project showed a consistently greater likelihood of experimentation with diverse kinds of drugs than those who had returned to drug use and those who had returned to drug use and those who had remained active on the Project.

Those who returned to drug use also showed, as had been the case in virtually all other studies of drug use, a precocity of exposure to drugs. Among those who had returned to drug use, for instance, five (50%) had tried a drug or a reefer before their 14th birthday, while only 3 (25%) of the active clients had done so by the age. Oddly, two of the persons terminated (40%) had tried drugs or reefers before their 11th birthday, compared to but one of those who quit (11%), none of the 12 still active on the Project, and one of the ten (10%) of those who returned to drug use. Again the smallness of the numbers makes the distinctions only suggestive, though the sharpness of the differential would appear to merit closer scrutiny in the future.

The usual distinguishing character of broken families also holds true for the present group. Not one of the ten persons who had returned to drug use, nor any of the nine who had quit the Project, had parents alive and living together at the time he was interviewed, compared to 3 of 12 of the active persons. On the other hand, there was a slightly greater tendency toward broken homes among the active clients prior to their 16th birthday, with 7 out of 12 (58%) reporting broken homes before they were 16 compared to 5 out of 10 (50%) of the persons having returned to use.

The persons still active on the Project showed families larger by one person than those who had returned to drug use - 3.8 brothers and sisters against the second groups' 2.9, with those who had quit, having 2.4 siblings. The groups were almost identical in regard to their response to the question: "How many relatives, outside your immediate family, have been close to you?", reporting 3.5 (users), 3.5 (actives), and 3.4 (quitters). Those who had been terminated, however, averaged 1,8, and 3 of the 7 persons in the total group of 36 who said that no one had been close to them in response to the question, were in the group that had been terminated.

The actives showed a higher number of close friends

(5.0) than the persons returning to drug use (3.4) and about the same as those who had left the Project (5.1). Neither the actives (5.3) nor the users (5.3) reported any difference in response to the question: "Outside of relatives and friends, how many people have taken a real interest in how you get along?"

In conclusion, the Project field staff did not exhibit striking success rates in terms of their individual abilities to remain on the job and away from drugs. This is somewhat surprising in that each of the workers were probably more success-prone than their addict cohorts (they were older, many were married and all had remained drug-abstinent for lengthy periods of time). A plausible explanation might lie in the requisites for the field work position, in that the workers were voluntarily exposing themselves dailyhto situation which they had not been able to handle in the past.

The one significant difference between the workers who remained with the Project and those who left, at least in the minds of the researchers, concerned the extremely high failure rates of females when compared with males. As stated previously, this attrition in nearly every case resulted from fraternization with a male Project client who was using. Although the sample was extremely small, the preliminary and very tentative indications are that female workers are inordinately susceptible to failure in this type of work.

SUMMARY

Drawing a composit picture of the "average" client of the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project during its first year of operation, we find that he was a male Mexican-American in his early thirties, currently using heroin and on parole for past violations related to drug use. He was single, living with relatives or a girl friend, and was known to at least one of the caseworkers personally.

Evaluating the success of the Project with its clientele is an exceedingly complex problem. The program was not designed as a research experiment, and no effort was made to randomize intake. It is planned during the next year to compare the outcomes of the Project clients with other persons of similar backgrounds and to determine as well how clients fared after contact with the Project in comparison with their previous records of drug use and imprisonment. Success, as we have noted, is a subtle item. For many clients it may represent nothing more dramatic than an extension of a usually brief period of freedom between sieges of addiction.

That so many persons - in the vicinity of 2,000 - found their way to the Project and continued to do so in increasingly large numbers as the first year came to an end, would seem to indicate clearly that the Project was offering a service that was needed and appreciated.

It is our intention to determine in the future what they get out of the Project and what they thought about what it offered them. Pending this evaluative work, it seems more than fair to indicate that all signs would appear to indicate that the Boyle Heights Narcotics Prevention Project provided a needed service to people in need, that it clearly filled a gap, and that the program very likely returned to the community many times in human and financial savings the amounts required to operate the program.